VOLUME XXXVIII No. 3

# The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
*Managing Editor*

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL CARDOZO PAUL KINIERY ROBERT F. McNAMARA
WILLIAM L. DAVIS THOMAS T. McAVOY JOSEPH N. MOODY

## Table of Contents

OCTOBER, 1952

ARTICLES

Henri Bellot Des Minières, Republican Bishop of Poitiers, 1881-1888 . . . . . *John Burwell Woodall* 257

Church and State in the United States: A Critical Appraisal . . . . . *John Tracy Ellis* 285

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . 317

NOTES AND COMMENTS . . . . . 363

PERIODICAL LITERATURE . . . . . 371

BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . . 378

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Benediktinisches Mönchtum in Oesterreich. Eine Festschrift der oesterreichischen Benediktinerkloester.* (Hildebert Tausch, O.S.B., Ed.). KURT VON SCHUSCHNIGG ..... 317

*The White Canons in England.* (H. M. Colvin). ALBERT C. SHANNON .. 319

*The Metropolitan Visitations of William Courteney, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1381-1396.* (Joseph Henry Dahmus). WALTER ULLMANN ..... 321

*The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest.* (John Gerard. Trans. by Philip Caraman). HARRY C. KOENIG ..... 322

*Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century.* (E. T. Davies). GERARD CULKIN ..... 324

*Les débuts du catholicisme social en France (1822-1870).* (Jean-Baptiste Duroselle). JOSEPH N. MOODY ..... 326

*The Rise of the Double Diplomatic Corps in Rome.* (Robert A. Graham, S.J.). THOMAS P. NEILL ..... 327

*The Life of Baron von Hügel.* (Michael de la Bedoyère). WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR ..... 328

*Catholicism and American Freedom.* (James M. O'Neill). GEORGE H. DUNNE ..... 330

*Democracy and the Churches.* (James Hastings Nichols). ROBERT F. MCNAMARA ..... 331

*Revêtues de force.* (Sister Marguerite-Felice, F.S.E.). RALPH KELLEY .. 333

*Enciclopedia Cattolica.* Vols. I-VIII. MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE ..... 335

*The Uses of the Past: Profiles of Former Societies.* (Herbert J. Muller). WILLIAM F. MCDONALD ..... 339

*Landmarks in the History of Education. English Education as Part of the European Tradition.* (T. L. Jarman). H. OUTRAM EVENNETT .... 340

*Readings in Western Civilization.* (George H. Knoles and Rexford K. Snyder, Eds.). JAMES J. FLYNN ..... 341

*Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ.* (David Magie). MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE ..... 342

*Studies in Roman Economics and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson.* (P. R. Coleman-Norton, Ed.). WILLIAM F. MCDONALD .... 343

*The Philosophy of the Enlightenment.* (Ernest Cassirer, Trans. by Fritz C. A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove). IGNATIUS BRADY ..... 345

*A History of Medieval Latin Literature.* (Maurice Hélin, Trans. by Jean Chapman Snow). ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER ..... 346

*Mediaeval Orvieto, the Political History of an Italian City-State, 1157-1334.* (Daniel Waley). MARY LUCILLE SHAY ..... 348

*The Hundred Years War.* (Edouard Perroy, Trans. by W. B. Wells). JOSEPH H. DAHMUS ..... 349

*The Age of the Baroque, 1610-1660.* (Carl J. Friedrich). WILLIAM KELLER 350
*Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert.* (Franz Schnabel). JOHN K. ZEENDER ..... 352
*Catholic Political Thought, 1789-1848.* (Béla Menczer). THOMAS P. NEILL ..... 355
*Revolutions of 1848: A Social History.* (Priscilla Robertson). CARL WITTKE ..... 357
*Cavalier in the Wilderness. The Story of the Explorer and Trader Louis Juchereau de St. Denis.* (Ross Phares). RICHARD O. GEROW ..... 358
*Louis XVI, le congrès Américain et le Canada, 1774-1789.* (Marcel Trudel). JOHN J. MENG ..... 359
*John Adams and the Prophets of Progress.* (Zoltán Haraszti). ALLAN J. DOHERTY ..... 361

# The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XXXVIII OCTOBER, 1952 No. 3


## HENRI BELLOT DES MINIERES, REPUBLICAN BISHOP OF POITIERS, 1881-1888


By

JOHN BURWELL WOODALL*


Republican bishops were a great rarity in the French Church during the 1880's and later. Avowedly monarchist bishops certainly outnumbered them, while a much larger number were also monarchist—even if not openly so. Others attempted to steer the difficult course of political neutrality or even reconcile themselves to the fact that the Third Republic was apparently to be no transitory phenomenon. Upon the heads of these circumspect and oftentimes intrepid prelates such epithets as "jacobin," "free mason," and even worse were usually heaped. There was one polemical term in frequent use which was often meant to connote all of these and even more—"republican." Only one bishop, however, appears to have been truly republican. The story of this man's conflict with his monarchist flock—to which only the talents of a new Anthony Trollope could do real justice—is the subject of the present study.

The time is that of the early *Ralliement*. The policy thus called began in the very first years of the reign of Pope Leo XIII, although it was not consummated until the 1890's. Its aim was to liberate the French Church from the corpse of monarchy and attach it to the living body of republican France through an alliance with the moderate republican elements. Its leading manifestoes were the famous toast pro-


* Mr. Woodall is with the Mid-European Studies Center of the National Committee for a Free Europe in New York.

nounced by Charles Cardinal Lavigerie before French naval officers at Algiers on November 12, 1890, and Leo XIII's encyclical to the Catholics of France of February 16, 1892, which has come to be known as the "Encyclical on the *Ralliement*." A long period of gestation was required for these dramatic and official acts. Events in the Diocese of Poitiers constitute one of the most interesting chapters of this phase of "pre-*Ralliement*."

## I

The Diocese of Poitiers belongs to the ecclesiastical Province of Bordeaux, and is co-extensive with the Departments of La Vienne and Les Deux-Sèvres. During the period under consideration its clergy were constantly and strongly influenced by the great landed legitimist families under their charge. In certain regions of the diocese the clergy were considerably more influential than was the case nearly everywhere else in modern France. But in most parts of the diocese the majority of the population was neither royalist nor actively Catholic.[1]

From 1849 to 1880 the episcopal office was held by Louis Pie, who has gone down in history as one of the most intractable legitimists ever to have worn the cloth.[2] Largely because of this, he was constantly ignored whenever Paris proposed to Rome its candidates for archiepiscopal station. But Leo XIII succeeded in bestowing the red hat upon him in 1879, and in this dignity of Cardinal Bishop of Poitiers Monseigneur Pie was laid to rest the following year.[3] Brief attention must be devoted to his political and religious opinions.

The regime of Napoleon III made persistent efforts to rally the Bishop of Poitiers. But the prelate remained "ungovernmental." He even permitted his clergy, the prefect reported, to turn religious pro-

[1] Jean Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du second empire de 1852 à 1869* (Paris, 1930), pp. 242 ff.

[2] "Il ne voyait de salut pour la France et pour l'Eglise que dans le retour aux principes de la monarchie traditionnelle et héréditaire." Mgr. Baunard, (Ed.), *L'épiscopat français depuis le concordat jusqu'à la séparation* (Paris, 1907), pp. 482-484.

[3] The standard biography, in two volumes, is by Mgr. Baunard, *Histoire du Cardinal Pie* (Poitiers, 1886). Dom Besse's *Le Cardinal Pie* (Paris, 1903) emphasizes his monarchism. Maurain's work, cited above, utilizes materials in the National Archives and is indispensable.

cessions into legitimist manifestations, and the churches became "veritable political clubs over which I am powerless to watch." Pie omitted hardly an opportunity to make an uncomplimentary allusion to the emperor, the most audacious being that contained in a pastoral in February, 1861, at the height of the tension over the Roman Question: "Lave tes mains, ô Pilate, la postérité repousse ta justification." Because of this license of metaphor, Paris ordered its officials in Poitiers to break off all relations with the bishop; and the interdict lasted until 1868, when there was reconciliation of a sort between emperor and bishop.[4]

After the fall of the Second Empire Poitevan Catholicism mobilized its forces anew for a Bourbon restoration. The clergy, noted one of their number, "expend themselves in political hopes from the realization of which they expect . . . France's return to religious thoughts and practices."[5] "All non-royalists are treated as liberals in the worst sense of the term."[6] During this period Bishop Pie was the close confidant and counsellor of "Henry V," at whose request he prepared the draft of a monarchist constitution emphasizing "the general principles of Christian politics." Pie considered the tricolor "hopelessly revolutionary" and applauded the pretender's decisive refusal to accept it, although Pius IX and most of the hierarchy were of the opposite mind.[7] "If God wishes to save France," the prelate commented, "he will inspire her with better inclinations. If not, she will perish a victim of her own stupid antipathies." France, he proclaimed on another occasion, was "equally incapable of the Republic, which promises her terror and death, and of the monarchy, which demands from her obedience and respect."[8]

Under Pie's episcopate Poitiers was one of the chief centers of the Catholic reaction against the increasing secularization of French society under the impulse of "liberal" and "progressive" philosophy. Here the reaction took the form of condemning practically *in toto*

[4] Maurain, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-245; 515-526; 836.

[5] Agnes Siegfried, *L'Abbé Frémont* (Paris, 1932), I, 66-67. Largely because of such circumstances Abbé Frémont requested his transfer from Poitiers. Later, as a Parisian parish priest, he became almost as well known for republicanism as Pie was for monarchism.

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 46.

[7] Edouard Lecanuet, *Les dernières années de Pie IX* (Paris, 1907), pp. 197 ff.

[8] Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 487 ff.; 498-501.

the entire evolution of modern France. The young Abbé Georges Frémont observed that "whoever wishes to advance is declared a liberal and a revolutionary."[9] On one occasion from the pulpit Pie even compared France to the epileptic who had been brought to Christ for healing. When the physician asked how long the malady had endured, the reply was made in words which meant unmistakably: "Since 1789."[10] Naturally, the bishop saw little good in those Catholics—known at this time as liberal Catholics—who, in his view, would treat with '89. Montalembert he denounced to the Vatican for his celebrated discourse at Malines in 1863;[11] Bishop Dupanloup he considered guilty of minimizing the Syllabus of Errors and of other mistakes.[12] The liberal Catholic ministers who held power under the presidency of Marshal MacMahon he termed "eunuques libéraux."[13] Their type of prudence, as exemplified in the ministerial circular enjoining the clergy to remain aside in the elections of 1877, evoked from Pie the characteristic comment: "May God . . . enlighten [these men]! May He preserve them from giving us once again the spectacle of the impotence of liberalism."[14] Legitimist monarchy being impossible in France, apparently the bishop even became resigned to the Republic as a lesser evil than an Orleanist and liberal monarchy which, he said, would have meant "[the destruction] of our last religious and national resource."[15] In the judgment of Father Edouard Lecanuet, the leading liberal Catholic historian of French Catholicism in the nineteenth century, Pie's opinions were "so absolute, so inflexible that they would have better suited the century of Gregory VII and Saint Bernard than our troubled times."[16]

* * * * *

When Cardinal Pie breathed his last in May, 1880, a grave crisis was in progress in the relations between Church and State. Anticlerical majorities had existed in the chamber of deputies since 1876

[9] Siegfried, *op. cit.*, I, 46.

[10] Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 509-510.

[11] Edouard Lecanuet, *Montalembert* (Paris, 1902), III, 361-362; Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 206-207.

[12] Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 226 ff.

[13] Pie to Bishop of Mende, March 30, 1877. Emile Rous, *Monseigneur Saivet, évêque de Mende et de Perpignan* (Lille, 1899), II, 457-458.

[14] Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 616.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 509.

[16] Lecanuet, *Les dernières années du pontificat de Pie IX*, p. 48.

and in the senate since 1879. At the beginning of this year MacMahon's government had resigned. A *republican* Republic took its place. One of the leading tenets of French republicanism of practically all schools was secularization or laicism.[17] The policy of secularization was expressed in a number of bills sponsored by Jules Ferry which attacked the influence of the Catholic Church in education. A provision of one of these bills—the celebrated "Article Seven"—forbade any member of an unauthorized religious order to teach in a public or private school. Since most clerical teachers belonged to such orders,[18] the measure would have largely expelled the clergy from the field of education. But in the senate a still fairly numerous "left center" joined forces with the Catholic monarchists and defeated the measure in March, 1880. In retaliation, the ministry of Charles de Freycinet enacted the famous "March Decrees," pronouncing the expulsion of the Jesuits at the end of three months and giving all other unauthorized orders the same period in which to request authorization or incur the same sentence. But comply with the decrees the orders steadfastly refused to do.[19]

For their defense the orders relied very heavily on half a dozen or so prominent Catholic laymen—"all ardent and militant Legitimists and irreconcilable adversaries of republican institutions."[20] When the Jesuits were expelled from their houses at the end of June, these and other monarchists made theatrical demonstrations, walking arm-in-

[17] Evelyn M. Acomb, *The French Laic Laws, 1879-1889* (New York, 1941) is an able account of the policy.

[18] Very few orders had actually been "authorized." To enjoy this status an order had to submit its statutes to the civil authority for examination. The laws requiring such had largely been enacted under the First Empire and July Monarchy. The Second Empire and the early governments of the Third Republic had ignored them. Under this regime of tolerance the regular clergy had enjoyed favorable conditions. Cf. Paul Nourrisson, *Histoire de la liberté d'association en France depuis 1789* (Paris, 1920), II, 215 ff.

[19] In this position they were supported by Rome, which considered the decrees abhorrent and legally defective. For this affair the following works should be consulted: J. Tournier, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie et son action politique* (Paris, 1913); Edouard Lecanuet, *Les premières années du pontificat de Léon XIII* (Paris, 1910); Eduardo Soderini, *Leo XIII, Italy and France* (London, 1935), utilizing the Vatican Archives; J.-B. Rovolt, *Vie du Père Le Doré*, 2 vols. (Besançon, 1925); Charles de Freycinet, *Souvenirs, 1878-1893* (Paris, 1913).

[20] Lavigerie to Leo XIII, July 24, 1880, in Tournier, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-84.

arm through the streets with the proscribed fathers.[21] A short time previously, Archbishop (later Cardinal) Lavigerie of Algiers, anxious to save what might yet be saved, with the approval of the apostolic nuncio, saw Premier Freycinet and with him worked out the details of a transaction whereby the superiors of the threatened orders would declare that in refusing to request authorization they were guided by considerations solely religious. They would explicitly disavow any solidarity with the monarchists. This was to satisfy the government which, for its part, would not press the matter of the request for authorization.[22] Freycinet allowed the respite granted to the orders to expire without taking any punitive measures (which he in reality did not wish at all to be forced to do) and counted on the declaration to serve as a *deus ex machina*. But when the declaration was presented to the superiors early in July, it was unanimously rejected. This action was taken after Joseph Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, had advised the superiors that the Catholic monarchist leaders, whom his vicar general had consulted, would regard any transaction as a defection. Public opinion, they had said, would consider it "an act of weakness inspired by fear, as a shameful capitulation." "In France," the prelate commented, "honor plays too great a role and is too noble a thing for the congregations to compromise it at the risk of sacrificing their rights and liberties."[23]

Up to this point Rome had not intervened. It did so, however, in August; and another declaration, similar to the one rejected in July, was sent to the superiors. But the Pope's entire responsibility was not disclosed, the instructions to the superiors merely stating that a "high authority" had "authorized" them to sign.[24] Perhaps because of this, the superiors, who overwhelmingly opposed the gesture,[25] and who were often supported by their bishops,[26] saw a means of

[21] Joseph Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, 1814-1914* (Paris, 1922), IV, 658 ff.; Gustave Gautherot, *Emile Keller* (Paris, 1922), p. 282.

[22] Tournier, *op. cit.*, pp. 65 ff.

[23] J.-B. Rovolt, *Vie du Père Le Doré* (Besançon, 1925), II, 46-48.

[24] The instructions are reproduced in Mgr. Besson, *Vie du Cardinal de Bonnechose*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1887), II, 637-638.

[25] Rovolt's biography of Father Le Doré, cited above, is illuminating. Le Doré, superior of the Eudists, was a convinced legitimist and signed the declaration, "le coeur brisé." *Ibid.*, pp. 54-60.

[26] Bishop Freppel of Angers took the view that the superiors were "perfectly free to sign or not to sign." Eugène Terrien, *Monseigneur Freppel* (Angers,

temporizing. But eventually, after considerable pressure in some cases, all superiors save one signed the declaration. Although the strictest secrecy had been enjoined on all parties concerned, a legitimist paper of Bordeaux managed to secure a copy of the declaration and printed it while the negotiations were still in progress.[27] Unable to weather the consequent political storm, Freycinet's government resigned in September. In October and November, the March Decrees were executed against thirty-eight orders of men, but orders of women were not molested.

The chief significance of this episode is that the Church of France had been pilloried before public opinion as bound to an unpopular political cause. Because of such circumstances, the policy of secularization, which was accelerated in the succeeding years, could constantly be defended before the public as a necessary and justifiable step. Partly because of the policy of secularization, and partly because of the strong opposition to the conciliatory gestures on the part of the Pope,[28] the *Ralliement* was to remain in the stage of gestation for another decade. Meanwhile, the French government made efforts to recruit episcopal candidates from the small numbers of clergy in whom it had some degree of confidence. Such was the man it proposed for the difficult heritage of the late Cardinal Pie.

## II

For several months the succession was held in suspense. The story of the negotiations to fill it constitutes one of the most interesting episodes in nineteenth-century French religious history.

The candidate of high Poitevan society and of most of the clergy was Charles Gay, Titular Bishop of Anthedon, and Auxiliary Bishop of Poitiers under Cardinal Pie. Like the former, Monseigneur Gay was a legitimist and ultra-conservative.[29] Had "Henry V" reigned,

---

1931-1932), II, 330. Cardinal Guibert told Father Le Doré that he expected "nothing at all" to be obtained. Rovolt, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

[27] Archbishop Charles Place of Rennes termed this act "Revolution in the Church." Place to Lavigerie, October 3, 1880, in Tournier, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-110.

[28] "Pauvre Léon XIII, il a remplacé sur la croix le bien-aimé Pie IX." Thus wrote regarding the Pope's policy in 1880 the future head of the French Trappists. Abbé Louis-Alexandre Fichaux, *Dom Sebastien Wyart* (Lille, 1910), p. 419.

[29] Cf. Dom Bernard du Boisrouvray, *Monseigneur Gay, Evêque d'Anthédon, Auxiliare de Son Eminence le Cardinal Pie*, 2 vols. (Tours, 1921). In 1881 Gay

Gay would certainly have been the next Bishop of Poitiers; under the actual Republic he had not even the shadow of a chance. When the Jesuits were expelled from their houses in Poitiers in July, 1880, Gay "mitred and crosiered, pronounced loudly and firmly the sentence of excommunication against the authors of this sacrilegious violation."[30] For this and many other reasons the government would have none of him. "If we are unable to find any other candidates save political adversaries and militant Legitimists," declared Armand Fallières, Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Religions (later, President of the Republic), "our only remaining step is to denounce the Concordat."

Henri Bellot des Minières, vicar general of the Archdiocese of Bordeaux, and the person reporting Fallières' remark,[31] was the government's "find." Two facts in the background of this heretofore rather obscure priest are of prime importance: 1) his father, a republican magistrate in southwestern France, had been one of the victims of Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* of December, 1851; 2) the son had grown up in the republican faith.[32] In June, 1880, the prefect of the Gironde recommended him for the episcopate as being "one of the ecclesiastics . . . on whom the government of the Republic can count."[33] "He is one of us through his origins and sentiments," wrote another republican sponsor.[34] In November François Cardinal Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, recommended him on behalf of the hierarchy.[35]

---

wrote Freppel that the exercise of universal suffrage in the approaching elections threatened "de tirer du sein de la mer ces bêtes néfastes dont parle l'apocalypse." Eugène Terrien, *Monseigneur Freppel* (Angers, 1930-1931), II, 362.

[30] Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 46.

[31] To Joseph Denais, editor of the liberal Catholic *Défense*. Cited in Edouard Lecanuet, *La vie de l'église sous Léon XIII* (Paris, 1930) p. 56. There is good reason for assuming that the statement was made to Bellot himself with the object of persuading him to accept the candidacy.

[32] There is no biography of Bellot and the only synthetic treatment is that in Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 56 ff.

[33] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Prefect of La Gironde to Minister of Religion, Bordeaux, June 11, 1880.

[34] *Ibid.* D. Reynal, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Public Works, to "mon cher ami," Paris, September 2, 1880. (*Paris-Journal*, December 7, 1880: "Il passe à Bordeaux pour professer les opinions républicaines les plus avancées"—probably an exaggeration.)

[35] *Ibid.* Donnet to Minister of Religion, Bordeaux, November 17, 1880.

For some time, however, Abbé Bellot hesitated to accept the difficult role of republican Bishop of Poitiers. The story of this aspect of the nomination is related by Dezeimeris, a Bordeaux republican official, in a letter to Reynal, an official in the Ministry of Public Works in Paris. For some time, the former advised, Bellot had been refractory "[to my frequent] exhortations to put in his country's service, in a situation where they can be effective, a liberalism and firmness which have become nearly unfindable among our clergy." However, a recent interview between Bellot and Fallières had largely succeeded in overcoming this attitude. But Bellot subsequently received a letter from Caduc, republican deputy from Bordeaux, which he showed to Dezeimeris in great anxiety. *"I fear,"* explained the latter, *"that Caduc, in transmitting some remarks of Fallières, involuntarily gave them a nuance which they perhaps did not have. Our deputy proposes to Bellot an episcopal see on two conditions:* 1) *That the nomination be made without prior agreement with Rome, which would learn of it by decree alone.* 2) *In case of non-ratification by the Holy See, he would promise not to resign."*[36]

Dezeimeris was reporting these facts to his good friend, Reynal, in the hope that he would take up the matter with responsible officials in the Ministry of Religion, and he took advantage of the occasion to offer them some brotherly advice. Regarding the first proposition, he said, the Republic must obviously choose its own men; therefore, if it was to pick bishops "who are not enemies of the Republic," it could not "lack both good sense and dignity" by going to Rome for advice. But to demand, on the other hand, that Bellot accept the possibility of remaining bishop *without* Rome was an entirely different matter. "He would be the scapegoat of a schism with no future and the flagbearer of a veritable religion of state." Leaving aside the possibility of Bellot's acceptance of this role, "such an extremity . . . is undesirable in itself, and could only be fatal to the Republic." The situation between Church and State, Dezeimeris went on to say, was "much more serious than is generally realized, [for] half of France cannot be made . . . to think like you and me." The Republic's task was to convince the still numerous practicing Catholics that if there *was* a form of government "logically compatible with the fraternal principles of true Christianity," it was the Republic. But one would succeed

[36] Italics mine.

only by choosing "upright, liberal, sincere bishops," and by using "a tradition which is a prestige [i.e., the right of direct nomination conferred by the concordat.]" It would, of course, be difficult to find other patriotic episcopal candidates like Bellot, but if these could be found, the others would see where the road to advancement lay. Why should not the government remain a government pure and simple, without attempting to play the role of a Church? Suppose the government proposed a bishop, and Rome rejected him. The bishop would resign, hypothesized Dezeimeris, "in the spirit of the Catholic priest." But the government would take its own time to choose another one, or even demand that Rome reconsider the first one. By no means should it attempt to make a schismatic bishop. It would thereby have "every propriety, all the logic and law" on its side. "You have been the Republic's lawyer," concluded the letter, "the time has come to be its counsel."[37]

Reynal sent the letter to Fallières and he added, "It is addressed to you through me. Read it, therefore, and tell me what I must reply to Dezeimeris and through him to Bellot."[38] What Fallières' reply was can only be conjectured, as the documents are lacking. Had Fallières actually ever entertained the notion of inducing Bellot—as had been represented by Caduc—to accept the possibility of becoming a bishop without Rome? In the absence of more conclusive evidence, this and other questions must remain unanswered. But even had this been the case, it is likely that he was dissuaded by Dezeimeris' earnest reasoning. In reality, he must have accepted the two alternative proposals: 1) that Bellot be nominated without the customary though non-concordatory formality of a prior consultation with Rome; 2) that the government should refuse to name another candidate in case Rome rejected him. The first proposal is significant because it indicates a much more independent attitude on the part of the government than had obtained during the 1870's.[39] The second proposal is even more significant—and astute. Had Rome rejected Bellot the government, in refusing to name another candidate, could have argued—with a considerable appearance of likelihood—that its candidate was

[37] *Ibid.* Dezeimeris to Reynal, Bordeaux, November 13, 1880.

[38] *Ibid.* Reynal to "mon cher ami" (obviously Fallières), Paris, November 14, 1880.

[39] The practice of the *entente préalable* had been customary under the ministry of Jules Simon as a means of avoiding open conflicts with Rome.

unacceptable to the Vatican *because* of his republican views. Finally, it may safely be assumed that the nuncio—the astute and wary Archbishop Vladimir Czacki—got wind of the whole scheme and contrived to avoid a conflict with the Republic over the nomination.[40] These assumptions are supported by a letter in Bellot's own hand. He said:

> I do not know how the nunciature, in which I have never set foot, and which showed itself to be very puzzled, learned of what was going on. I do not know either who delivered my name to the press. . . . More than ever I place myself in your hands, happy and proud to be entirely devoted to the work of appeasement and patriotism which is also your own. . . .[41]

Whatever had really happened, Poitiers soon got its new bishop. The nomination was published on December 4,[42] and the bulls of canonical institution arrived the following month. One comment on the nomination, when it was first announced, is worthy of citation. It read:

> Mgr. Bellot's friends themselves are astonished to see him deliberately accept the crushing succession of Mgr. Pie. [He is known to be intelligent] but that is precisely why people are surprised to see him assume a charge which would be difficult for anyone and which for him in particular will be most difficult. [His background and opinions] will perhaps not be an omen of success. . . .[43]

On February 2, 1881, the new bishop took formal possession of his see and from that moment until his death seven years later the diocese was the scene of bitter strife.

## III

The first incident followed the inaugural pastoral letter which Bellot himself read from his cathedral pulpit before an overflow audience. The discourse was of the type which catches the attention of even the

[40] The *Figaro* reported on November 28, 1880—before the nomination was officially announced—that the Holy See had turned down (écarté) some episcopal candidates—"notamment celui que le gouvernement destine au siège de Poitiers." It went on to say: "Mais le Ministre des Cultes ne voudrait pas céder, et M. Gambetta [le] pousse vivement à la résistance."

[41] Archives Nationales, F19 2556, Bellot to Fallières, Poitiers, November 28, 1880.

[42] It was dated December 2, the anniversary of the *coup d'état*.

[43] *Le Moniteur*, December 7, 1880.

most passive listener. It referred to the nomination as having been "an unexpected . . . token of appeasement and *détente* in a moment of singular crisis;" it expressed gratitude to the Pope and "infinite gratitude" to "the men devoted to their country [i.e., the ministers]." The conflict between the Church and the Republic arose from a "tremendous misunderstanding" rather than from any real incompatability between them. "We were made to understand each other," declared Bellot, "since we have none but the same aspirations." He had reflected "with infinite apprehension" on the fate of a host of Catholic institutions. Were there not already enough ruins? Many Catholics, as if unaware of this, were contemplating "holy leagues" against the Republic. For the bishop, however, there would "never be *any*[44] Holy League save that in favor of the Law of God." The clergy served a Master whose kingdom was not of this world—"We are not and never will be of any party."

There was a reference to the mutability of human institutions: "The face of this world passes and is renewed. . . . Successive and unfolding facts are in sum nothing but the expression of the Will of God. . . . Humanity was not created always to be poured into the same mould and bear the same stamp. . . . The Church's role is to guide the peoples in their course and help them accomplish their evolution." Save for the desire to advance "concord and fraternity" Bellot would never have accepted the new charge.[45]

This homily of advanced liberal Catholicism, at a time when the French government was preparing to accelerate the "evolution" of French society by laic laws and had already expelled the religious orders, must have caused Cardinal Pie to turn over in his grave! The new note was, indeed, far more than the surviving old coterie of intransigent Catholic monarchists could tolerate. As the biographer of Bishop Gay remarked, "From the first phrases people were seen to pass inquiring looks. They pricked up their ears as if the better to grasp the sense of the words. Soon there was general stupefaction; Monseigneur Gay sank down in his stall."[46]

Charles Gay was later charged by Cardinal Lavigerie with belonging "to the coterie of pious persons [who prayed] for the conversion

[44] Italics mine.

[45] *Lettre pastorale et mandement de Mgr. l'Evêque de Poitiers à l'occasion de la prise de possession*, Bordeaux, February 2, 1881.

[46] Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 55.

of Leo XIII."[47] At the present moment, however, it was a question of the conversion of the Bishop of Poitiers. Nonetheless, for a time Gay kept his own counsels. Abbé Marnay, formerly Pie's and now Bellot's vicar general, attempted to maintain him in this course. Marnay had talked man-to-man with Bellot and had taken it upon himself to offer some brotherly advice to Gay. Bellot, he said, was unreservedly determined to maintain the Church's rights against the State, and would do so in due time, but equally determined to demonstrate that his opposition was solely religious in motivation. He intended that the pastoral letter should be an olive branch to the Republic and not a declaration of war; consequently, it would have been discordant to refer in it to the attacks against the religious orders. He had been aware that such tactics would incur the risk of offending many Catholics; but he hoped sooner or later to pacify all of them whose religious convictions were not dominated by a certain party spirit. Would not Gay, Marnay urged, therefore talk with his bishop later, rather than write to him now? "I myself am grateful to him for his good intentions," he said, "and beseech you, Monseigneur, to reserve for your dear diocese and for the general good every possibility of being useful to him."[48]

But Gay, ignoring this appeal, took up his pen the following week. He wrote:

> Have you been informed, dear Seigneur, that several of your priests wept, and that all either lowered their eyes or anxiously glanced at each other? Why this is just the contrary, said they, of what we have been taught for the past thirty years from this great pulpit. . . . [They] cannot understand how you were able to qualify as a "misunderstanding" this impious, masterly (*savant*), and ferocious war which Free-Masonry . . . is waging against the Church of God and the resistance that the Church is endeavoring to oppose thereto. What! a misunderstanding, Monseigneur, this acute phase of the struggle . . . between truth and falsehood, good and evil, Heaven and Hell, the world and the Church, Jesus Christ and Satan . . . a struggle in which—making allowance for patience towards sinners—the first of all charities and the Church's formal doctrine impose a strict obligation not to remain neutral! . . .

---

[47] Lavigerie to Lodovico Cardinal Jacobini, papal Secretary of State, July 22, 1885. Tournier, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

[48] Marnay to Gay, March 4, 1881, in du Boisrouvray, *Monseigneur Gay*, II, 58.

One wonders how you could praise as "devoted to their country" these iniquitous and sacrilegious men who have just weakened, dishonored, and risked ruining it by destroying, as much as they were able, the holy and necessary monastic state, the flower and honor of the Church, and who . . . continue to sap the Christian edifice in its foundations. One wonders again how these men and you, anointed by the Lord, divine light of your people, "are made to understand each other" and "have the same aspirations" . . . how, furthermore, and in what sense, *the successive and unfolding facts are nothing but the expression of the Will of God.* . . . One asks finally if the official and legal apostasy of peoples and governments is *an evolution of the human race* and one of the forms of *this progress* which you appear to say that the Church must follow, with which it must at least become reconciled. . . .

That monarchist principles are still favored in your new diocese, and notably among the most faithful Christians, is undoubted . . . [but] if the Republic is so strongly contested, it is certainly not so much because it is a Republic as because . . . it seems to wish to be identified, both in act and principle, with hatred of religion. [Unless you retrace your steps] you will be abandoned by nearly all your priests and faithful. . . .[49]

To quote other letters denouncing the pastoral would merely be repetitious.[50] "'*A peste, fame et Bellot libera nos Domine!*' was repeated in the sacristies. At the bishop's very table and under his very eyes priests circulated newspapers heaping him with insult."[51]

There was quite a bit of insult, indeed, although the legitimist press in general alluded to the incident in pained and dignified terms,[52] and although Louis Veuillot, now ill and near the end of his days, was unable to brand Bellot as a new and more pestiferous Dupanloup. But Paul de Cassagnac, editor of the Bonapartist *Le Pays,* did not hesitate to step into the breach as defender of the faith. Others might be able to repress *their* indignation but Cassagnac, "overwhelmed by anger and shame," and confident "that my voice is the echo of nearly all who believe and pray," could not. Some bishops bought their

[49] Gay to Bellot, March 12, 1881. *Ibid.,* II, 375-380.

[50] Freppel to Bellot, February 26, 1881: "You dare to call 'men devoted to their country' the scoundrels who drag her to the abyss . . . these henchmen of Free Masonry. . . ." Terrien, *Monseigneur Freppel,* II, 347-350.

[51] Lecanuet, *La vie de l'église sous Léon XIII,* p. 59.

[52] Cf. *Le Courrier de la Vienne* (Poitiers) for the period. Bishop Freppel advised the editor of *L'Océan* (Brest) to exercise restraint in order not to furnish arms to the republicans and liberal Catholics. Terrien, *op. cit.,* II, 350-351.

mitres by "veritable treason" and endangered "the grandeur of our faith" more than did the entire hosts of irreligion. This was particularly true of "the unworthy successor of Cardinal Pie . . . this lion who is replaced by a polecat." (!) "Since the Revolution," Cassagnac continued, "no voice so audacious has been raised in the Church to bless the persecutors and extol the executioners."[53]

It would be unprofitable to dwell further on the crusade to deliver Poitiers. One ironical element, however, should be noted: In excommunicating Bellot as a sort of present-day Talleyrand, Cassagnac found himself in strange company—that is, if persons at extreme poles of left and right can be said to constitute such when they find a common object of attack. For the radical republican press branded Bellot as a mitred Tartuffe bent upon duping the new Orgon.[54] Since laic virtue was often naive, avowedly monarchist bishops were not nearly such good potential seducers.

What was Rome's reaction? It cannot be stated with certainty, although de la Bouillerie, legitimist Coadjutor Archbishop of Bordeaux, who was then at the Vatican, reported it as follows: "The Pope entrusted to me the delicate mission of conveying [to Bellot] the expression of his acute sorrow. This I did immediately and Bellot replied in a letter filled with sentiments of docility and humility and, which seemed to me, of repentence. The Pope appeared satisfied. . . ."[55]

Nothing short of complete recantation would, of course, have satisfied most of the others. Charles Freppel, Bishop of Angers, and Alessandre Sebaux, Bishop of Angoulême, hoped for a time that their neighbor would repudiate his pastoral letter or at least attenuate it by actions in a contrary sense.[56] But all that Bellot did was to make some allusions in March, 1881, to anti-clericalism,[57] and later to denounce

[53] *Le Pays,* February 27, 1881. Freppel's letter to Bellot quoted Cassagnac's last sentence. (Reference given in Note 50.)

[54] "Ces gens-là [i.e., prelates like Bellot] n'embrassent la République que pour l'étouffer." *Le Petit Parisien,* February 23, 1881.

[55] De la Bouillerie to Gay, April 19, 1881, in du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.,* II, 57.

[56] Terrien, *op. cit.,* II, 352.

[57] According to *Le Journal de la Vienne* (Poitiers), March 16, 1881, Bellot declared: "S'il faut combattre, nous combattrons, s'il faut mourir, nous mourrons." If this meant, the *Journal* commented, that Bellot saw he had taken the wrong road "bien des choses pourraient être oubliées, et il n'en serait plus jamais parlé."

the law promulgating the secularization of primary instruction (1882), which, he said, inaugurated "a mode of education unheard of before now"—parents could not send their children to schools where "impiety" was taught.[58] These denunciations were enough to displease the administration[59] and part of the republican press,[60] but not enough to pacify the other camp. And Bishop Bellot, albeit he had solemnly declared he would "never be of any party," may have been guilty, as was charged, of "omitting no opportunity to manifest cordial sympathy towards republican personnel and disdain for royalists."[61] Whatever his real shortcomings were, he found himself by the end of 1881 in open warfare with his clergy and monarchist laity.

## IV

From the very first, according to Bellot's own account, the most active agent of this group was an Alsatian priest, Louis Klingenhoffen, former protégé of Cardinal Pie, and chaplain to the convent of Les Filles de Notre Dame. Klingenhoffen had no opinions of his own; he had written in fulsome terms to his bishop until episcopal appointments were made, leaving him and his friends aside; then he easily became the royalists' mouthpiece. This faction, Bellot asserted, had "sworn to exhaust my patience by their outrages and force me to leave Poitiers." And he continued, "I have irrefutable testimony that Abbé Klingenhoffen has defamed and slandered me . . . both publicly and privately, and even in Rome . . . where he represents me as hated

[58] *Le Courrier de la Vienne et des Deux Sèvres* (Poitiers), May 21, 1882.

[59] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Prefect of La Vienne to Minister of Religion, Poitiers, June 5, 1882; reporting that Bellot's pastoral against the law of 1882 "contrasted singularly" with his first pastoral and betrayed "surprising tendencies on the part of a bishop pretendedly liberal and very prompt in private interviews to manifest deference for the government." It had incited, the prefect charged, certain priests to threaten to refuse First Communion to children attending the laic schools. On this and later incidents, cf. also: Prefect of Les Deux Sèvres to Minister of Religion, Niort, July 8, 1882; Prefect of La Vienne to same, February 22, 1886.

[60] According to *Le Rappel* (June 20, 1882), Bellot was expected to say and should have said something like this: The secularized schools were not irreligious; they were necessarily neutral because the State could not be partial to any confession. The school "must remain a school pure and simple" because it could not be simultaneously "church, temple, synagogue, and mosque." The State was concerned with the child's mind only and left his soul to others.

[61] Correspondence from Poitiers, in *L'Union* (Legitimist), October 20, 1882.

and scorned by my diocese." The abbé's faculties of preaching and hearing confessions were revoked by the bishop on December 13, 1881. The following month, Bellot, contemplating that Klingenhoffen would appeal to Rome against the sentence, conferred with Gambetta and Paul Pert, then Minister of Religion, and both had promised the government would intervene on his behalf. After Klingenhoffen's appeal was filed Bellot again requested the government to act. He stated, "I solicit this support—frank, prompt, and energetic; my cause is also that of the government. . . ."[62]

The kind of support requested was, of course, granted, although it was perhaps not so necessary as one might gather from the foregoing appeal. Early in April the French ambassador to the Vatican was instructed to act. It was necessary "that Rome know well the real state of affairs in the diocese of Poitiers, by what manoeuvres the government's adversaries were attempting to destroy episcopal authority there and what might be, in the pending question, the grave consequence of a decision invalidating that of the bishop." On June 17, 1882, Ambassador Desprez reported a decision of the Congregation of the Council upholding Bellot. Throughout the case, he advised, Rome was never hostile to the bishop, to which he added, ". . . I merely had to present these observations for them to be clearly understood and their full import grasped."[63]

Bellot thanked the government[64] and transmitted the decision to his clergy accompanied by a confidential letter qualifying Klingenhoffen's latest act as an "addition to his faults [with the strong support and encouragement of] the very persons who should have been the first to reprove his attitude." But the Roman tribunal had merely decreed *lectum ad instantiam* which meant, according to Bellot, that "the complaint was not even judged worthy of discussion." He said, "I at least hope that the ecclesiastics who have been forgetful of their

[62] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Bellot's apologia for this affair is contained in three separate documents: his letter to the Minister of Religion, March 28, 1882; to the Directeur Général, March 29, 1882; and a printed and private memoir: "Mémoir en réponse à l'appel formé en Cour de Rome par M. d'abbé Louis Klingenhoffen contre une décision de Mgr. l'évêque de Poitiers." The memoir, dated April 10, 1882, was the defense in Rome, and contained several depositions against Klingenhoffen.

[63] *Ibid.* Copy of a dispatch from Desprez to Foreign Minister, June 17, 1882.

[64] *Ibid.* June 27, 1882. "Quelle que juste que fût ma cause, je sais que le plus bienveillant appui du gouvernement m'était indispensable."

promises of respect and obedience toward their bishop will return to sentiments worthy of their character and past. The Holy See's decision can do no other than end a factious opposition which nothing, especially at the present time, can excuse. . . ."[65]

But the "factious opposition" had in reality just begun. The cathedral chapter replied with "Humble Remonstrances" on July 21, 1882. Their tone, in spite of the title, was haughty and censorious. It did not behoove the canons either to say whether the bishop had justly "accused and denounced again a priest . . . already punished, *if he were guilty*,[66] by six months of preventive suffering," or to discuss whether Bellot had "correctly interpreted the true meaning of the sentence," or whether there was not "a right to a new appeal." But the canons did make two protests: 1) "You declare that Abbé Klingenhoffen again added to his faults by complaining to the Pope, which would imply that one must incline before all episcopal decisions."[67] 2) "Several passages in your letter single us out. Who else could have been designated by your reference to those who have 'strongly supported and encouraged' Abbé Klingenhoffen? It is ourselves whom you denounce to all your clergy since we were the only 'ecclesiastics' in your diocese to intervene openly and publicly in this affair. [Thereby] we merely did our duty by one of the most beloved and honourable of your priests. . . ."

"Humble Remonstrances" from a chapter to a bishop are one thing; broadcasting them to the lower clergy and to the press is quite another. One of the canons saw to it that every priest in the diocese as well as the local Bonapartist press received a printed copy. Bellot suspected Morisson, secretary to the chapter, since Morisson had previously circulated among the clergy a memoir hostile to him, and because all the other canons denied responsibility for the present incident.[68] The prefect reported that Morisson and Canon Maynard

[65] *Ibid.* "Lettre confidentielle de Mgr. l'Evêque de Poitiers portant à la connaissance de son clergé un jugement de la Sacrée Congrégation du Concile," Poitiers, July 3, 1882.

[66] Italics mine.

[67] Bellot denied that he had meant that: "When the priest *knows himself to be guilty* (italics mine) he thus seeks only to exercise his vengeance." This statement appears in the margin of a copy of the "Humble Remonstrances" in the National Archives and appears to be in Bellot's own hand.

[68] *Ibid.* Directeur Général to Prefect of La Vienne, September 12, 1882; referring to previous information from Bellot.

appeared to be the guilty parties;[69] it seems very likely, however, that Maynard alone was the guiding spirit of the enterprise.[70] The author of the disclosure even contrived a refinement of insult and injury—the publicized "Humble Remonstrances" bore the subtitle: "Communicated to the priests of the diocese *confidentially*, like the episcopal letter."[71]

Late in September Bishop Bellot learned that Gay was to preside over religious festivities at Niort, within his very diocese, although he himself had not even been invited.[72] Refusing to drink these last dregs in his bitter cup of humiliation, he decided to strike against the rival bishop. He wrote:

> Your name, with the distinctive sign of your sacred character, under the pretended "Humble Remonstrances" has climaxed the injustices which I have had to suffer. I have misunderstood less than anyone the impropriety of these attacks, publicized in order that nothing should be lacking. . . . Do not be surprised, therefore, that after having reflected before God, I am placed under the painful necessity of withdrawing, not your title of Auxiliary Bishop of Poitiers, since you yourself voluntarily renounced it, with marked affectation, from the very first; but rather the various provisions and authorizations which I so fraternally granted you, at your request, March 21, 1881.
>
> It is only too evident that your exercise of all these episcopal functions is no longer possible, either in the city of Poitiers or in the rest of the diocese.[73]

"This time," the canons insolently wrote the bishop, "you have hit your target and can spare yourself from striking again. . . . The

[69] *Ibid.* Prefect of La Vienne to Directeur Général, Poitiers, October 8, 1882.

[70] "Un passage d'une lettre de Mgr. Gay semble en attribuer la responsabilité an chanoine U. Maynard." (Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 81). Maynard was a bitter foe of all "liberal" clergy and author of a polemic against Abbé Lagrange's biography of Dupanloup.

[71] I have utilized throughout a printed copy of the "Humble Remonstrances," which is deposited in the National Archives. Gay's signature was first in this copy, and five others also signed. Of the two remaining canons, one (Bellot's secretary) did not sign, while a second was absent. Du Boisrouvray says (*op. cit.*, p. 81) that the guilty person juggled the order of signatures to make Gay appear chief of the cabal, since his name was third in the original. (This seems odd, to say the least, since Gay was dean of the chapter.)

[72] "An apologist for Mgr. Bellot," in *Le Soir*, October 20, 1882.

[73] Bellot to Gay, September 21, 1882, in Lecanuet, *La vie de l'église sous Léon XIII*, p. 60.

expellers of the religious orders are vindicated. . . . Your measure will reverberate throughout Catholicism."[74]

The monarchist press left nothing undone that such should be the case. One paper stated, "Mgr. Gay has received from all of good Poitevan society the most flattering testimonials of sympathy and condolence."[75] Another asked, "[If Gay pontificated now] would the Episcopal Palace have him seized bodily by four Free Masons?"[76] Still another comment was, "The Poitevan clergy's example should be followed wherever episcopal authority is the humble servant of the sorry government which God in his wrath gave France in chastisement. . . . There is only one thing Bellot can do: Resign."[77] Said Cassagnac, "He addresses himself to Marianne, not to the Holy Virgin."[78] A further sharp remark was, "Before dying, Mgr. de la Bouillerie[79] asked pardon of God and man for having contributed to his elevation to the episcopate."[80] Freppel vainly urged Cardinal Donnet, Bellot's metropolitan, to order the lifting of the sentence.[81]

Bellot's adversaries now forgot even the last remaining rules of common sense. On October 28 the *Gaulois* published an article in its literary supplement entitled "The Poetry of Mgr. Bellot des Minières." It stated, "In all the previous articles about Bellot there has never been one on his books. A distinguished bibliophile of Versailles, Count d'Orfeuille,[82] has sent us two volumes by him." One, a volume of poetry[83] dedicated to Cardinal Donnet, had been published in 1864; the other, a translation of a minor Roman poet,[84] in 1868. Both these mediocre and long since forgotten works were now exhumed to brand the Bishop of Poitiers as a voluptuary. The method

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

[75] *Le Clairon* (Legitimist), October 8, 1882.

[76] *Le Journal de l'Ouest* (Poitiers), October 5, 1882.

[77] *Le Petit Caporal* (Bonapartist), October 20, 1882.

[78] *Le Pays*, October 16, 1882.

[79] Deceased Coadjutor Archbishop of Bordeaux who was called as a witness in Rome's investigation of Bellot, 1880.

[80] *Le Gaulois*, October 18, 1882. The same charge was later repeated in *Le Journal de l'Indre-et-Loire* (Tours), December 7, 1883, quoting "un dignitaire ecclésiastique."

[81] Terrien, *op. cit.*, II, 399.

[82] In real life, according to Lecanuet (*op. cit.*, p. 61), a Poitiers priest.

[83] *A travers le siècle* (Paris, 1864).

[84] *Les églogues choisies de Calpurnius* (Bordeaux, 1868).

was to isolate obscure texts and frame them with the "appropriate" commentaries for garbelling. The contextual passages were carefully suppressed and passages sometimes a hundred pages removed substituted instead. The passage receiving the greatest prominence was one containing the line "Notre ciel à nous, c'est un sein chéri." This was avowed to be Bellot's ideal. There was no indication, of course, that the incriminating line had been the author's characterization of the young Dante's philosophy.[85] Gay had devoted his pen to religious books; Bellot to obscenity.

In the second half of November Bellot departed for Rome—"summoned" it was charged, "by the Pope, who wishes to address to you a *redde rationem*. Cast yourself at his feet and ask him for a cell in some convent, where you can weep and expiate to the end of your days the temerity which made you accept, if not solicit and covet the episcopal dignity. . . ."[86] "There is but one outcome," Gay wrote Cardinal Jacobini at the Vatican, "and everyone here cries for it: that Bellot humbly and honorably resign in requesting a canonicate at Saint-Denys."[87] The Bishops of Angoulême and St. Dié reportedly represented Gay and the chapter of Poitiers in Rome;[88] Bellot was supported by a letter from his metropolitan. It was charged—to be sure—that this letter was extorted by ruse: Cardinal Donnet had actually been so enlightened by the disclosures of abomination in the *Gaulois*' "review" of his former vicar general's poetry—one dusty volume of which had been *dedicated to him!*—as to exclaim that Bellot had better never ask him for support in Rome again! "We

[85] Two brochures defending Bellot set the record straight: "Les poésies de Mgr. Bellot des Minières: simples notes d'un critique," Rome, November 19, 1882; "Les poésies de Mgr. Bellot des Minières et le *Gaulois*, par un laïque poitevan" (Paris, 1882). A third brochure, "Les poésies de Mgr. Bellot des Minières: le *Gaulois* et le laïque poitevan" (Paris, 1882), ridiculed the author of the second as an ignoramus.

[86] From the third brochure, cited above. *Le Gaulois*, December 16, 1882, claimed that "un membre éminent du clergé" was the author. Apparently this was again Canon Maynard. Cf. *Le Journal du Loiret* (Orléans), December 30, 1882.

[87] Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 99. Saint-Denys was the usual refuge for French bishops who had resigned.

[88] *Le Voltaire*, December 26, 1882. Lecanuet (*op. cit.*, pp. 63-64) quotes a letter from a French prelate stationed in Rome to Joseph Denais, December 12, 1882, referring to "les démarches regrettables de deux évêques français" against Bellot.

have authentic and written proof of this," it was said, "which could be produced if necessary."[89] Bellot was also supported—for the second time that year, and again at his own request[90]—by the French government. Bishops must be protected against calumny, wrote the Minister of Religion in briefing his colleague in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the case, especially "at a time when the French government takes care to choose only such persons on whom it has received the most satisfactory information." He continued, "The Pope will not hesitate, I am convinced, from the moment that the facts have been clearly set forth by our ambassador, severely to condemn such doings."[91] No one, of course, but the most obdurate believers that Bellot incarnated the anti-Christ or the most wishful thinkers could have expected Leo XIII to do otherwise. The expectation of others not so naive or malevolent was that the Pope, out of concern over the implacable opposition in the Diocese of Poitiers, would either attempt to negotiate with the government Bellot's transfer to another see or request his resignation.[92] According to the French chargé's report, however, the chapter received a reprimand for the "Humble Remonstrances," and Lorenzo Cardinal Nina, a member of the Roman Curia, took "the formal engagement" to solicit for Bellot the title of assistant at the pontifical throne.[93] Bellot was urged to sue the authors of the defamatory pamphlets for slander.[94] The interdict against Gay was not lifted.[95]

[89] *Le Journal de l'Ouest*, December 20, 1882. Two days later it further reported, in a letter from "un lecteur": "Moi aussi, j'ai les preuves écrites...." Gay's biographer (*op. cit.*, p. 98) insinuates that Donnet's letter was of doubtful value, as the cardinal, now very aged, "ne jouissait . . . de toutes ses facultés mentales."

[90] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. A note from the Minister of Religion (November 21, 1882) refers to such a letter of request from Bellot, but I was unable to locate the latter.

[91] *Ibid.* Minister of Religion to Minister of Foreign Affairs, undated copy.

[92] According to one of Gay's correspondents in Rome, the Pope did exactly that. Bellot was to return to Poitiers but later find a plausible excuse for resigning. (Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 97, citing letter from Léon Pagès of January 4, 1883.) Without access to the Vatican Archives it is, of course, impossible to ascertain how the Pope really felt.

[93] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Copy of dispatch from De Monbel (chargé d'affaires) to Foreign Minister, December 17, 1882.

[94] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, p. 64. It seems unlikely that Bellot ever acted on this advice.

[95] Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 98.

Bishop Bellot returned to France to find himself the idol of certain republican senators and deputies who urged his elevation to a much more important post than Poitiers. This group petitioned the government to nominate him as Archbishop of Bordeaux since the see had just been vacated by Cardinal Donnet's death. The succession in this case was particularly important because archbishops of Bordeaux were highly eligible for eventual elevation to the cardinalate. Bellot had already curbed one anti-republican bishop, his protagonists pointed out; he could, therefore, tame the "absolute, bellicose, audacious" younger clergy of Bordeaux where he would be welcomed "with the greatest fervor" by all the liberal elements. Bellot was termed the bishop who had "given proof of his attachment to liberal ideas," who had been "veritably crucified because of his republican opinions," who was "the only bishop to be named because he always was a republican," and "the first Gallican bishop [to be] welcomed by the Pope with benevolence and sympathy." According to his parliamentary admirers Bellot was so naturally designated for the vacant post that to by-pass him would imply that he seemed less worthy to the government than "those who turn republican on occasion."[96] To nominate him, however, would serve to make clear where the road to the mitre really lay.[97]

The partisans of the Bishop of Poitiers printed five copies of their recommendations; one each for the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Religion, the Director General of Religions, and (later) Bellot himself. This was an incautious step because it reckoned without the possibilities of Emile Flourens, the director general. Although Flourens had acquired considerable preponderance in episcopal nominations (since he himself remained at his post while ministers themselves came and went), one bishop had been made without him—Bellot des Minières. This was an egregious blunder and fatal to Bellot's future advancement because Flourens

[96] There was, indeed, some justice in this charge, e.g., the case of François Trégaro, appointed Bishop of Séez in 1882 after protestations of loyalty to the Republic, and subsequently one of its most implacable adversaries. (Cf. Trégaro's dossier, F19 2582.)

[97] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Ten deputies to Minister of Religion, December 23, 1882; three senators to same, December 26, 1882; "Note des sénateurs et députés républicains de la Gironde" and an attached "Note complémentaire." Other recommendations: Bordeaux Academy, January 3, 1883; Bellot's vicar general, January 12, 1883.

still held a trump card; a sort of clandestine collaboration with the *Figaro*, held in reserve for such emergencies. Flourens' copy of the proposals "went astray" and was published in the *Figaro* on February 1, 1883,[98] with the added charge that the bishop had actually written the letter of recommendation himself. While Bellot denied in the *Univers*[99] any responsibility for forwarding his candidacy, and although one of his sponsors came to his rescue in the same paper which had obliged Flourens,[100] the damage had, of course, already been done. On March 31 *La France* announced that the candidacy had been "definitely rejected." An Orléans paper stated, "A high opposition is said to have been made against it."[101] Another "governmental" prelate, Bishop Amate Guilbert, who had previously stirred up a hornet's nest of monarchist opposition at Gap and Amiens, was appointed to the post. Guilbert was to die vested with the dignity of the cardinalate; Bellot remained for life at Poitiers.

## V

After this incident Bellot went progressively out of the limelight, gradually entering into a more "conservative" period. In February, 1886, the diocesan bulletin reprinted editorials from the *Univers* attacking the government's policy toward the religious orders.[102] In January, 1885, following an exchange of letters, Bishop Gay accepted Bellot's invitation to conduct vespers in the cathedral of Poitiers.[103] But reconciliation with Gay did not, however, end the opposition of all the others. As one contemporary commented, "For five months [Bellot's]conduct has been more than correct; however, several of his adversaries are more furious against him than during the period when he acted differently."[104]

[98] Archives Nationales, Dumay Papers, F19 2002.

[99] *L'Univers*, February 4, 1883, which commented: "On s'attendait à un désaveu plus sévère."

[100] *Le Figaro*, February 6, 1883.

[101] *Journal du Loiret*, April 19, 1883, obviously referring to the Vatican. It appears unlikely that Rome ever would have sanctioned Bellot for so important a post, even had the candidacy not been so awkwardly managed in the first place.

[102] Archives Nationales, F19 2556. Prefect of La Vienne to Minister of Religion, Poitiers, February 22, 1886.

[103] Du Boisrouvray, *op. cit.*, II, 114 ff.

[104] Abbé Vareilles to Gay, February 22, 1885. *Ibid.*

There was one other important reconciliation—with Bishop Charles Freppel. In January, 1887, the latter pronounced a panegyric on St. Hilary in Poitiers' cathedral at Bellot's invitation. "From the moment that Mgr. Bellot returns to us and to our ideas," Freppel commented, "we do not have the right to repel him. Such would hardly be either evangelic or episcopal."[105] In June Bellot, characterizing himself as "l'incorrigible indiscret," again wrote urging Freppel to deliver the panegyric of St. Radegunde the following August, assuring the Bishop of Angers that by his mere presence "la fête gagnerait cent pour cent." Bellot was reportedly "comblé de joie" by Freppel's acceptance.[106] The 1887 festivities of the coronation of St. Radegunde, patron saint of Poitiers, were particularly important because they marked the 1300th anniversary of the Frankish queen who had descended from her throne to become the servant of the poor. The ceremony had traditionally been accompanied by cortèges and processions as the statue of the saint was carried through the streets from its repository in the parish church of St. Radegunde to the cathedral, a short distance away, where the coronation took place, after which the statue was returned to its own church. The incident which followed—an interesting and typical example of the clash which so often occurred in French towns over public religious processions—shows how Bellot had lost in favor with his original supporters.

On August 3 the mayor forbade any cortège or procession for August 14, the scheduled date of the festivities. The parish clergy of St. Radegunde alone could accompany the statue as it passed through the streets. The *Avenir,* local republican journal, referred to the mayor's decree as an "abortive coronation." All that had ever been intended, it claimed, was a demonstration of clericalism against the Republic. "The beast is wounded, but not yet dead: Beware of its venom." If the "clericals" must bring out the statue "let the curé of St. Radegunde put it in a box and have a commissary cart it [to the cathedral] quite simply on a wheelbarrow."[107]

Vainly Bellot protested in a letter to the mayor: "There is nothing, absolutely nothing of a political character in the contemplated ceremonies."[108] On August 10, the *Avenir* charged that the "clericals"

[105] Freppel to Abbé Grimault. Terrien, *op. cit.,* II, 571-572.
[106] *Ibid.,* II, 586-587.
[107] *L'Avenir,* August 6 and 9, 1887.
[108] *Le Courrier de la Vienne* (Poitiers, monarchist), August 7, 1887.

planned to circumvent the mayor's ban by adjourning the celebrations until August 15-19, another festive period. The mayor then decreed: "All public cortèges and processions are forbidden during the month of August, and notably from the 15th to the 19th."[109]

The ceremonies finally occurred on the date originally scheduled. As was to be expected, there were "incidents." The "clericals" joined the parish clergy in the streets, and cried—according to the *Avenir*—"Lâches, salauds, cochons, franc-maçons!" (The *Avenir* did not state what those so denominated replied.) "A colonel, accompanied by a Jesuit," even forced the police cordon and joined the procession.[110] When the statue left the cathedral the crowd shouted, according to the monarchist press, "Vive Sainte Radegonde! A bas Thézard [mayor]! A bas Cleiftie [prefect]!" As it went back into its own church a group of workers in a nearby cabaret antiphonated: "Vive la Commune!"[111]

Did Bellot err in bringing Freppel to Poitiers? Was there sufficient reason, from the presence of so many monarchists, for the mayor to prohibit the procession? Would there have been no ban under different circumstances? Or can a state based on "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité" remain true to its avowed principles when it prohibits freedom even to "clericals"? One thing at least is certain: the "republican bishop" had definitely lost the favor of the administration. Several years earlier he had been rated an "A" bishop by the Director General in Paris;[112] one may wonder what his "grade" was now.

The final chapter in Monseigneur Bellot's tumultous career remains to be briefly noted. Early in 1888 he paid an *ad limina* visit to Leo XIII, who bestowed on him the title of assistant at the pontifical throne and Roman count. Before returning to Poitiers he stopped over in Paris. There, in the Faubourg St. Honoré, lived an elderly lady who had formerly been the superior of a convent in Bordeaux.

[109] *Ibid.* August 14, 1887.

[110] *L'Avenir*, August 17, 1887.

[111] *Le Courrier de la Vienne*, August 17, 1887. Freppel's biographer states (*op. cit.*, p. 593) that there were "scandalous incidents" and "energetic resistance of the Catholics."

[112] Archives Nationales, F19 2002. "Liste d'évêques avec leur valeur" (undated, probably 1883 or 1884), grading from "A" ("bon") to "D" ("violent"). The list is contained in the series F19 2002-2005: "Papiers trouvés chez M. Dumay, directeur des Cultes."

The convent had been drastically reformed by the action of the secular ecclesiastical authority, which in doing so did not in all respects observe canonical rules, and the superior had elected to resume the lay state. Abbé Bellot had taken her part in the controversy which ensued. Accompanied by his vicar general, Bellot called on this lady on March 15, 1888. Here he died suddenly, only a few moments after his arrival. Political enemies saw to it that the web of innuendo and outright slander which had threatened to ruin his reputation and his career now dogged him anew even in death.[113]

Henri Bellot des Minières is significant largely because he belonged to the small group of prelates like Lavigerie, Guilbert, Lecot, and Meignan—and parish priests like Abbé Frémont—who prefigured the *Ralliement* during the period of its gestation. He was certainly far more republican—and endowed with considerably less wisdom—than any of them. Even Lecanuet, the only Catholic historian who has attempted to defend his memory, considered him "naive, maladroit, and devoid of judgement."[114] Even so (as Lecanuet points out) there is no real evidence that he was an unworthy bishop. Like other "republican" bishops of this period,[115] Bellot has had no biographer, in contrast with Gay, Freppel, and other monarchist prelates, all of whom have had their panegyrists.

The Abbé Auguste Juteau, who succeeded to Poitiers (1888-1893), although less openly republican and certainly more circumspect than his predecessor, also ran afoul of the political and religious factionalism attendant on the administration of this difficult diocese.[116] No French prelate, in fact, managed completely to avoid both the Scylla and Charybdis of contemporary politics. For it was practically impossible to remain entirely aloof from all parties.[117] The Cassagnacs,

[113] Lecanuet, *La vie de l'église sous Léon XIII*, pp. 64-66, which cites some choice comments from the pen of the notorious Mgr. Justin Fèvre, self-appointed watchdog of the orthodoxy of "republican" and "liberal" bishops. Fèvre's aspersions against Bellot's moral character even match what Edouard Drumont himself wrote on the same subject.

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[115] Notably Guilbert and Lecot, both of whom died as cardinals.

[116] Lecanuet (*op. cit.*, pp. 66 ff.) gives a brief account. I have utilized Juteau's dossier in the National Archives.

[117] In the *Anjou* (monarchist paper published largely under his direction) Bishop Freppel constantly argued that this was closely related to religious indifference.

Drumonts, Arthur Loths, Auguste Roussels, Justin Fèvres, and Emmanuel Barbiers alone—not to mention men like Clemenceau, Combes, and Viviani in the opposite camp—would see to it that such was the case. Behind these lay and clerical writers stood intransigent Catholic monarchists, some of whom later even reached the anomalous position of protagonists of the *Action Française*, the monarchist party of "clericalism without God"—the other kind having failed to produce a king.

The opposition of a goodly portion of French Catholics would consequently be directed against Cardinal Lavigerie when he officially launched the *Ralliement* in his famous toast of Algiers on November 12, 1890. Even Leo XIII after his encyclical of February 16, 1892, would feel its full impact.

*New York City*

# CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

By

JOHN TRACY ELLIS*

"A remarkable work, spacious, erudite, and magnanimous. . . . Nothing like it has been undertaken before; nothing like it will need to be done again. It is unique and definitive." Thus did Professor Henry Steele Commager of Columbia University characterize the monumental work of Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes in the New York *Herald Tribune* of July 9, 1950, two months after its publication on May 10 of that year.[1] It was a judgment with which most reviewers have been in substantial agreement, although a few others such as Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., in the *Review of Politics* [XIII (April, 1951), 261-262] and William E. McManus in the *Commonweal* of April 18, 1952, found considerable fault with the work and were much more qualified in their evaluations, especially insofar as some of Canon Stokes' basic assumptions on separation of Church and State and personal theological predilections were concerned. In a publication of such magnitude and scope, embodying data and views on which men have differed radically since the dawn of American history, it was inevitable that varying reactions should be shown to a work embracing almost every conceivable phase of the often controversial relationship of the Church to the State.

At the outset some idea of the quantitative achievement of Canon Stokes may be conveyed to the reader by stating that he develops

* Father Ellis is professor of American church history in the Catholic University of America.

[1] *Church and State in the United States.* By Anson Phelps Stokes. Three volumes. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1950. Pp. lxix, 936; 799; 1042. $25.00 per set.) A request for a review copy of this work was declined because of the high costs of production, and it was stated that in consequence the publisher was forced to consider "only those magazines of larger circulation or those which have a very special editorial interest in the book." (James S. Best to the reviewer, New York, July 11, 1950). It would certainly appear that the *Catholic Historical Review* had a special editorial interest in the work. In fact, the editors considered the work so important that, in spite of limited space, it was suggested that the present review-article be written and published.

his theme in twenty-six chapters which comprise a total of more than 2,300 pages. His narrative opens with a brief introduction by Professor Ralph H. Gabriel of Yale University and a preface of twenty-four pages wherein the author sets forth his reasons for writing these volumes and the method he has pursued in the arrangement of material, footnotes, etc. The footnotes which are found at the end of the respective volumes total 128 pages, and Volume III closes with what is termed a "Critical and Classified Selected Bibliography," which runs to sixty-seven pages, a forty-five-page table of dates, thirty-eight pages of appendices and addenda, and finally an index of 115 pages. The volumes are likewise embellished with 116 splendid illustrations that have been chosen with care and taste and, all things considered, the publisher has furnished Dr. Stokes with an attractive, dignified, and accurately printed medium which is worthy of his conscientious labors of so many years.

The arrangement is roughly along chronological lines, although that order is not strictly adhered to and the reader is not altogether spared the tedium of repetition which a work of this size and thoroughness frequently entails. Volume I traverses the colonial period and the early nineteenth century up to the time when Church-State problems relating to the Civil War began to appear. Volume II embraces all the leading questions as they touched upon the approach of civil conflict, its prosecution, and its aftermath. To this are added the post-war developments in Church and State over political and social issues, and the adjustments in the realm of racial and religious questions affecting groups like the Jews, the Irish, and the Mexicans in the Southwest. But by far the longest section of Volume II (270 pages) has to do with the Church and State in the field of public and church education, a subject on which Canon Stokes reveals a deeper feeling than on any other which he treats. Here he traces the problem down to August, 1949, where he ends with fourteen pages on the controversy between Cardinal Spellman and Mrs. Roosevelt which took place at that time. Volume III is confined principally to the twentieth century and deals with social problems such as legislation on divorce and birth control, social welfare programs, the attitude and conduct of the churches during the two world wars, and the public status of the churches and of religion as they have emerged in contemporary American society. The narrative of the final volume, furthermore, contains a summary and interpretation of Church-State

relations in the United States from the respective viewpoints of the federal and state governments, the churches, and the public, as well as an exposition of the basic philosophical principles upon which these are thought to rest. In the last chapter Canon Stokes treats of religion in relation to a democratic society, of religious freedom to civil and political freedom, and of personal religious freedom to public responsibility on the part of the individual citizen.

It is manifestly impossible to consider here every phase of a work so tremendous in size and so rich and varied in content. For that reason the reviewer trusts he may be pardoned if he concentrates on points pertaining to the history of American Catholicism, in view of the special interests of readers of this journal. This approach will at times entail real differences with the author, as well as fairly numerous citations of factual errors and slips, and it may, indeed, run the danger of producing a negative impression concerning the general merits of the work. This the reviewer would sincerely regret, for he would wish to make clear his admiration for the painstaking labors and over-all accomplishment of the author, and especially for the attempt to be fair to all concerned which characterizes his writing on this controversial theme. Canon Stokes' work is one which every educated American can read with profit and which every student of American religious history must regard as essential to his professional knowledge. With these points established it is to be hoped that the comments which follow will not leave readers under any false impression as to the solid value which the reviewer attaches to these volumes.

In Volume I and the first third of Volume II Canon Stokes has described what he terms the "Foundations and Historic Adjustments through the Civil War." After two chapters on the significance of the general subject of the relations of Church and State and the basic facts and considerations that govern a discussion of the subject insofar as the United States is concerned, there then follows a chapter wherein the old world background is laid by tracing the roots of ideas and historic events which have influenced American thinking and action on Church-State relations, democracy, and religious freedom. This section opens with the Old Testament prophets and continues through the Greek philosophers, the principal writers of the ancient and mediaeval Church, the Renaissance and the Religious Revolt of the sixteenth century, and the politico-religious changes which tran-

spired in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (I, 65-151). The last topic afforded a natural transition to the English settlement of North America in the early seventeenth century, and from that point the author moves on through the colonial, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods in an exposition of ample proportions, comprising no less than 500 pages (I, 151-647). Thereafter the three major religious groups, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, are treated in separate chapters from the viewpoint of their respective adjustments to American Church-State conditions up to the generation preceding the Civil War (I, 651-883).

Through all the myriad facets of the complicated theme of this first volume Canon Stokes preserves a benign air of objectivity, and the critical student of history will find little reason for serious fault-finding, even though at times he may differ with the author in his interpretation of ideas and evaluation of sources. The aim which Dr. Stokes stated in his preface, namely, "to state facts fairly" (I, xlviii) has in the main been realized, and the reader's appreciation of the vast accumulation of factual data in Volume I will in no way be weakened by bias or prejudice that would detract from the profit and enlightenment to be derived from a close reading of the book. Nonetheless, there are some points on which the reviewer considers that Dr. Stokes is either in error or on which his interpretation is open to question. For example, it is incorrect to say that in the early days of the Republic the American minister to France, Benjamin Franklin, was approached by the representative of the Holy See with the proposal of a concordat with the United States (I, 32-33). Actually the nuncio in Paris, Archbishop Giuseppe Doria Pamphili, made no such proposal. He merely informed Franklin in a letter of July 28, 1783, that the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, in its desire to effect an organization for the infant American Church, had determined "to propose to the congress the installation of one of their Catholic subjects . . . with the powers of vicar-apostolic, and with the character of bishop. . . ."[2] Likewise, to speak of the many concordats with Latin American countries as "attempts on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to regulate the relation of the Church to the State" (I, 33) and to omit mention of the fact that in a number of instances

[2] Doria Pamphili to Franklin, Paris, July 28, 1783, in Jules A. Baisnée, *France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy. The Myth of French Interference, 1783-1784* (Baltimore, 1934), p. 50.

the State was equally anxious for a concordat that would yield to it the appointment of bishops and other prerogatives in the ecclesiastical sphere, is to see and present only half of the picture. In reference to the charter granted to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 for settlement in North America, it was not "the first reference to religion in any charter or constitution in the regions which later became the United States . . ." (I, 38). Sixty-one years before the grant by the English crown to Raleigh, the Emperor Charles V, in his capacity as King of Spain, issued a patent to Lucas Vasquez de Ayllón on June 12, 1523, which stated that the principal intent of the discovery and settlement of new lands in Florida would be to bring the Indians "to understand the truths of our holy Catholic faith, that they may come to a knowledge thereof and become Christians and be saved, and this is the chief motive that you are to bear and hold in this affair. . . ."[3]

The treatment of the Catholic Church's role in the politico-religious questions of the Middle Ages (I, 84-99) is on the whole a balanced one, although this reviewer does not share the unqualified enthusiasm of Canon Stokes for the contribution of Marsiglio of Padua. To attribute to Marsiglio so much that is fine in modern thought, including "the beginnings of the notion of natural law and natural rights as principles of democratic government" (I, 87) prompts the regret that the brilliant analysis of the *Defensor pacis* and its influence on men like Thomas Cromwell in the field of Church-State relations to be found in Philip Hughes' *The Reformation in England* (New York, 1951) did not appear in time to be seen by the author. Father Hughes demonstrates how Marsiglio's conclusions, to the effect that religion should be wholly dependent upon the State and that in the Church the prince should be supreme, worked out in practice in the case of the English Church. That is a case study which might well give any churchman pause before he bestows upon Marsiglio praise of so high an order.[4] The author is generous in his tribute to the Catholic Church for its many works of social betterment during the Middle

[3] Charles V to Ayllón, June 12, 1523, in John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886), I, 105.

[4] Cf. Hughes, *op. cit.*, pp. 331-341. Hughes—no defender of absolutism in any form—characterizes Marsiglio's *Defensor pacis* as "perhaps the most mischievous book of the whole Middle Ages . . ." since, as he says, "its aim was the destruction not only of the papacy, or of the cleric's power to rule the layman, but of the whole position that religious ideas, which are independent of human author-

Ages, but his discussion does not gain in cogency by quoting with approval the statement from the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* to the effect that "the Franciscan movement stands as the first powerful assertion of the rights of the individual against church authoritarianism . . ." (I, 93). An examination of the constitutions of the Dominican Order, as well as those of its great contemporary, the Franciscan, should convince anyone that there existed within the Church of that age a genuine assertion of the rights of the individual which was not directed against "church authoritarianism," and which did not form any part in the "long series of explosions" which led to the Protestant Revolt. Canon Stokes likewise speaks here of the attempts of Gallicanism and Febronianism as experiments of national Catholic churches in communion with Rome which, as he says, "may have their important bearings on the development of the Roman Catholic Church in this country" (I, 97; III, 454). There is no evidence in fact or tendency of which the reviewer is aware to indicate such a possibility. Here the wish would seem to have been father to the author's thought.

Dr. Stokes has many precedents for his brave attempt to picture Oliver Cromwell as an example of relative religious toleration in the mid-seventeenth century, but to the mind of many readers he will have succeeded no better in this regard than his predecessors. For example, he quotes Cromwell's ban against the saying of Mass in Ireland and states that the Cromwellians were opposed to persecution or interfering with a man's religious belief, to which is added the comment, "But they could not recognize forms and ceremonies whose practice they thought inimical to civic liberty and security" (I, 122). This type of reasoning will hardly satisfy critical readers. To be told further that in an age of persecution Cromwell abstained from persecution "with a few tragic exceptions" (I, 123), is, to say the least, an understatement. In September, 1649, Cromwell personally led the attack on Drogheda where in a general massacre around 3,500 persons of both sexes were put to death out of vengeance for the earlier massacres in Ulster for which, as Professor Edmund Curtis, a non-

---

ity, are the ultimate norms of man's conduct, in public affairs no less than in his private life" (*op. cit.*, pp. 331-332). His entire treatment of the influence of Marsiglio on Thomas Cromwell, Stephen Gardiner, Edward Foxe, *et al.*, is well worthy of close study.

Catholic historian, has said, "he quite mistakenly held all Irish papists responsible."[5] When one recalls the similar fate that befell Wexford, New Ross, and other Irish towns in that terrible year, one may be excused if he demurs from the canon's all too gentle handling of Cromwell in the story of religious toleration. One of the author's most winning qualities as a writer of history is his ability to treat unpleasant facts in a spirit of charity and benevolence. But in cases such as that of Cromwell—and there are too many in these volumes—the truth would have been better served by a little stronger mixture of the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove.

In the treatment of Church-State issues in colonial America Canon Stokes covers the ground with admirable thoroughness. But it is not accurate to speak of the Catholics as having "dominated" Maryland at any time in the colony's history since they were never in a position even numerically to do so (I, 166); and to say that Catholics did not "fare as well" after the Protestant conquest of Maryland as the Protestants had done under Catholic auspices (I, 194) is another one of those understatements which does not convey a true picture of the fate of the Catholics under the penal code. The praise which is given to Roger Williams' *Bloudy Tenent* is understandable for the influence which it had on the doctrine of separation of Church and State, but that work—with its enlargement of the view that "God requireth not an uniformity of Religion"—also made its contribution to the gradual breaking down of religious dogma. In this connection it may be observed that Canon Stokes rarely fails to accord a welcome to any man or movement which dulled the edges of dogmatic differences. From the standpoint of lessening the potential friction spots between various religious denominations, this is well enough. But the problem is wider than that, and for that reason it is surprising to find the Episcopalian canon applauding a tendency in American Protestantism that for generations has been eating away at the dogmatic foundation of many American religious groups. It is a problem to which the author has given thought *en passant* in his volumes but in the opinion of this reviewer at least he has never faced it squarely.

Among the final factors considered before the American Revolution is that of Freemasonry (I, 244-253). The influence of Freemasonry in history is an admittedly difficult subject to trace and, on the whole,

[5] *A History of Ireland* (New York, 1937), p. 250.

the author's handling of it may be regarded as adequate, although here again a too roseate coloring appears at times. To speak of European Masonry as undoubtedly opposed to "ecclesiasticism" and "all forms of priestcraft" (I, 251) is less accurate than to state candidly that it was opposed to the Catholic Church and its priests. One might ask if the Catholic schools of France in the days of Emile Combes and Aristide Briand and the Catholic parochial societies and associations of Italy during the ministries of Agostino Depretis and Francesco Crispi could justly be characterized as the off-shoots of "ecclesiasticism" and "priestcraft" which it was legitimate to persecute and to hound out of existence. And for Canon Stokes to say that in the United States there has never been anything in the laws of Freemasonry to bar a Catholic from joining the lodges if he cared to do so and his ecclesiastical superiors would permit, is not sufficient to explain the differences between the grimmer aims and methods practiced by the Masons against the Church in Europe and the milder opposition employed in this country.

When he reaches the American Revolution Dr. Stokes enters upon a period which was much more fruitful in religious liberty than had been true of colonial America. Emphasis is rightly given to the Quebec Act of 1774 as a cause of the Revolution, although the pointed insincerity of the letter of the Continental Congress of October 26, 1774, to the inhabitants of Quebec concerning their religion—when read against the petition to George III of the same day and the addresses to the inhabitants of the British colonies and the people of Great Britain five days before—robs it, in this reviewer's opinion, of much of the significance attributed to it by the author (I, 262, 459). One misses here, incidentally, any reference to the able monograph of Charles H. Metzger, S.J., *The Quebec Act. A Primary Cause of the American Revolution* (New York, 1936).[6] During the course of the war the churches in general supported the American cause, with the exception of many adherents of the Church of England who for obvious reasons sympathized with the mother country. General Wash-

[6] In treating Catholicism in the colonial period and the years of transition to a national state Stokes would have profited from a use of three able monographs not mentioned here, viz., Sister Mary Augustina Ray, B.V.M., *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1936), Arthur J. Riley, *Catholicism in New England to 1788* (Washington, 1936), and Joseph F. Thorning, *Religious Liberty in Transition* (New York, 1931).

ington showed a genuine awareness of the influence of religion, not only by abolishing celebration in the army of Guy Fawkes' Day on November 5, 1774, so offensive to Catholics, but in a more positive manner by directing the attention of his troops to the need for religious observance as, for example, in his order of May 2, 1778, wherein among other notable remarks he said, "To the distinguished character of a Patriot, it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of a Christian" (I, 272).

Among the chief factors promoting the advance of freedom during the American Revolution the author enumerates thirteen leading citizens who, in his judgment, contributed greatly to that end. One of these was Thomas Paine to whom credit is rightly given for his leading and influential role as a propagandist for the cause. But the reviewer finds it a bit strange to note Canon Stokes' enthusiasm for a man whose indirect contribution to religious freedom stemmed, we are told, from his passionate desire to set men free from "the inherited tyrannies of orthodox views of political absolutism and ecclesiastical religion." The author admits that as a result of Paine's effort "the established churches were weakened and independence of thought encouraged" (I, 318), but it does not seem to strike him as too serious that religion itself was weakened by Paine's attacks. Immediately following the section on Paine there is an admirable sketch of Father John Carroll (I, 324-333) which succeeds in emphasizing all the sterling qualities of that remarkable churchman as they manifested themselves during this important period of American history. From the treatment of James Madison (I, 339-350) it is not difficult to see why his name has figured so prominently of late years in the constitutional aspects of Church-State problems, for of the early American statesmen he would seem to have been the most secular-minded on all matters touching the relations of Church and State. Madison had approved chaplaincies for Congress in 1789 and as President supported the system, but toward the end of his life he even changed his mind on this concession by government to religion and opposed its continuance (I, 456). The attitude of Madison was clearly revealed in 1822 in a letter to Edward Livingston in which he said, "I have no doubt that every new example will succeed, as every past one has done, in showing that religion and Government will both exist in greater purity the less they are mixed together" (I, 491).

During the Revolution and the years that followed most of the original states took long strides forward in throwing off the shackles of religious intolerance which they had inherited from their colonial law. It is a congenial theme to Canon Stokes, as it would be to anyone who cherishes the religious liberty that has become so fortunate a part of the American tradition. The action of the various state conventions in writing new constitutions is detailed and it is made clear that a number of them were quite tardy in the full grant of religious freedom to Jews and Catholics. Yet it is not entirely true to say that Catholics had enjoyed anything like adequate religious and civil liberty in colonial Rhode Island (I, 463).[7] Moreover, when North Carolina came much closer to that ideal in its convention of 1835, it was as a result of the personal triumph of William Gaston, the distinguished Catholic associate justice of the state supreme court, that the word "Christian" was substituted for "Protestant" as a qualification for office holders, a fact that is not mentioned here (I, 403). The struggle to remove the legal restrictions against Catholics encountered even greater resistance in other states. It was only in 1844 that New Jersey made them eligible for office, while the voters of New Hampshire as late as 1922 defeated a proposal of their state constitutional convention to remove the word "Protestant" from a phrase of their bill of rights which authorized public support for "teachers of piety, religion and morality." In that critical period there were few men of prominence who had more personal reasons to rejoice over the dawn of real religious liberty for the infant Republic than Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Near the end of his long and eventful life he told a Baptist minister of New York in a letter of October 9, 1827:

> To obtain religious, as well as civil liberty, I entered zealously into the Revolution, and observing the Christian religion divided into many sects, I founded the hope that no one would be so predominant as to become the religion of the State. . . . God grant that this religious liberty may be preserved in these States, to the end of time, and that all believing in the religion of Christ may practice the leading principle of charity, the basis of every virtue (I, 464).

If Carroll had been living 120 years later he would have welcomed the Freedom Train of 1947, but he would have noted with regret the

[7] Cf. Evarts B. Greene, *Religion and the State* (New York, 1941), p. 51, for colonial Rhode Island's restriction of citizenship to Protestants.

absence of the Toleration Act of 1649 of his native Maryland from its exhibits, an item which would in truth seem to have been much more significant in the story of American religious freedom than the *Bay Psalm Book* of 1640 (I, 473).

Canon Stokes' next section is devoted to the provisions of the federal Constitution on religious freedom and separation of Church and State. Here, too, there is an ample record, and the opinions of the founding fathers on the first amendment are fully set forth, including that of Daniel Carroll who is quoted from the *Annals of Congress* as having thought "it would tend more towards conciliating the minds of the people to the Government than almost any other amendment he had heard proposed" (I, 542). In this section the author first makes clear—a viewpoint which he emphasizes at greater length in Volume II—his strong approval of the recent and more extreme interpretations of the Supreme Court on the separation of Church and State. To the canon, the Everson and McCollum decisions have shown that the first amendment "must be broadly interpreted in the interest of maintaining the separation of the two institutions" (I, 540). In support of his position he shows a commendable caution in his reliance on the views of James Bryant's *James Madison* (Indianapolis, 1941, 1948); nonetheless, he is obviously gratified with those decisions. For him the Supreme Court's application of the fourteenth amendment to the religious freedom guarantee of the first amendment is "the new substantive theory of law" (I, 577). Throughout his discussion (I, 580-599) he is in the main on the side of the Everson and McCollum decisions, although in the case of the former the author seriously questions in another connection the phrase which rules out laws to "aid all religions" (II, 705). But on the subject of financial aid to private schools his personal views show through to so marked a degree that as he approaches the end of his treatment one feels that he lays aside the garb of the historian and dons that of the advocate (I, 592-593).

From here to the end of Volume I the course of American religious freedom and its practical application during the early nineteenth century is detailed. Among the factors considered is the development of higher education and the break that followed in some of the older institutions, as well as in the new state universities, with orthodox religious doctrines of the colonial era. Dr. Stokes mentions the founding of Catholic colleges as one sign of an expanding freedom, which

it was, but to say that it was "doubtful" if a Catholic college could have been established in colonial Maryland in view of its existing laws is scarcely realistic (I, 636). It was not doubtful; it was impossible, as the Carrolls and other Catholic families learned to their sorrow in having to send their sons abroad to gain a Catholic education. In speaking of the Great Awakening and the education fostered by the churches on the western frontier, it is stated that the church, "both Protestant and Catholic, had done some previous work in educating the Indian . . ." (I, 669). Actually what the Protestant churches had done before 1815—the period under discussion—was relatively insignificant in comparison to the efforts which had been expended for over two centuries by the missionaries of the Catholic Church among the red men. Dr. Stokes laments the divisive results which ensued for American Protestantism in the bumptious new Republic, and he rightly assigns as reasons for them such factors as the spirit of freedom that pervaded the land in those years, the isolation of frontier life, and the controversy over slavery (I, 779). But he does not say anything of the basic and most important cause, namely, the Protestant doctrine of private interpretation and the lack of a source of religious authority which Protestants would respect and obey. Here, surely, was the principal cause of multiple denominationalism, for the Catholic Church on the frontier had to meet the same perils as its Protestant neighbors and yet no serious schisms broke its ranks. In relation to the frequent charge of divided loyalty which was hurled against the Catholics in the early years of the nineteenth century, Canon Stokes states that today the devotion of Catholics to the United States has been proved, but when he adds, "the old bugbear of divided loyalty seldom arises to afflict us . . ." (I, 806) one wonders if he has forgotten Paul Blanshard whose charges against Catholic loyalty in recent years have brought real afflictions upon the unity of the American body politic.

Volume II opens with a chapter devoted to twelve national issues which had their origins shortly before the Civil War and in which the churches figured. They included the anti-duelling campaign, Sunday mail controversy, anti-Masonic and anti-lottery campaigns, religious journalism, temperance, the Mormons, non-sectarian public education, the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War and annexation of California, diplomatic representation at the Vatican, and finally the communistic and what are called "other new religious

communities" in the United States. In the author's remarks on religious journalism he names the *Shamrock* of the New York Irish colony as having really begun Catholic journalism in the United States in 1810 (II, 31). Actually the first professedly Catholic paper was started the previous year in Detroit by Father Gabriel Richard, S.S., in his *Michigan Essay*. Moreover, the nine Catholic daily papers mentioned for 1940 (II, 38) were almost entirely foreign language journals and only the *Catholic Daily Tribune* of Dubuque which had been founded in 1920 and lasted down to 1942 was in the language of the vast majority of American Catholics.

But it is the section devoted to non-sectarian public education in this chapter which will, in all likelihood, elicit the most disagreement, for in these pages (II, 47-72) the author's strong personal views appear as on no other topic. Canon Stokes views sympathetically the movement for secularizing the public schools which set in with Horace Mann in the 1830's and 1840's, and no one who has an acquaintance with religion as it was taught in the schools of that period can gainsay the fact that it endangered the religious convictions of some pupils while it strengthened those of others. Yet the dilemma which Mann himself adumbrated as early as January, 1838, when he said—as quoted from his first report to the Massachusetts Board of Education—the "entire exclusion of religious teaching, though justifiable under the circumstances, enhances and magnifies a thousand fold, the indispensableness of moral instruction and training" (II, 55), has not been solved in any satisfactory way. The moral instruction and training called for by Mann, and wholeheartedly urged by Dr. Stokes, a sincerely religious man, have not kept pace with the speed of secularization which has overtaken American society since Mann's time, with the result that today the nation is confronted with the menace of a generation of youth that is in good measure religiously illiterate. Dr. Stokes' treatment of the New York school controversy of the 1840's fails to mention one of the prime arguments of Bishop John Hughes in asking for financial aid for Catholic schools, namely, that the so-called non-sectarian schools were actually sectarian by reason of their use of the King James Bible, as well as of textbooks which were seriously biased against the Catholic faith and which reflected the Protestant control of these schools (II, 65). Moreover, to attribute a consistently liberal stand to the Catholic Church on immigration and to speak of its

opposition to birth control in any sense as motivated by its desire that it might one day be "the dominant element in the American scene" (II, 71) will strike most American Catholics as rather ridiculous.

In the section devoted to American-Vatican relations (II, 85-112) the author tells the story from the time President Polk suggested American diplomatic representation at Rome in his message to Congress of December, 1847, through the Myron Taylor episode of the 1940's with its attendant furor. One meets here some interesting quotations, among which is one of Secretary of State William H. Seward on September 27, 1862, to the American minister at Rome, Richard M. Blatchford, which is significant for its appraisal of the role of the Catholic immigrant as an American citizen and for the attitude of the Pope toward American institutions. Seward adverted to the increase in recent years of Catholic immigrants to this country and he then stated:

> Our country has not been slow to learn that while religion is with these masses, as it is with others, a matter of conscience, and while the spiritual authority of the head of their church is a cardinal article of their faith, which must be tolerated on the soundest principles of civil liberty, yet that this faith in no degree necessarily interferes with the equal rights of the citizens, or affects unfavorably his loyalty to the republic. It is believed that ever since the tide of emigration set in upon this continent the head of the Roman Church and States has freely recognized and favored the development of the principle of political freedom on the part of the Catholics in this country, while he has never lost an opportunity to express his satisfaction with the growth, prosperity and progress of the American peoples . . . (II, 89).

The remark that Pius IX gave "virtual recognition" to the Confederacy during the Civil War (II, 90) is not borne out by the evidence when closely examined.[8] Canon Stokes handles the delicate matter of American-Vatican relations on the whole very judiciously. Yet is is hardly proper to quote the *Christian Century* (II, 100) and the *Federal Council Bulletin* (II, 108) on the "insistent demands" and "pressure" of the American hierarchy for appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican when no proof is offered. If the two authors whose words are cited above possessed evidence for their

[8] Cf. Leo F. Stock, "Catholic Participation in the Diplomacy of the Southern Confederacy," *Catholic Historical Review*, XVI (April, 1930), 1-17.

charges it was incumbent upon them to state it; if not, it was manifestly unfair for them to impute actions to the American bishops which they could not prove. Canon Stokes would seem to share to some degree in these suspicions, for among the causes which he enumerates for a revival of anti-Catholicism since World War II "has undoubtedly been the determination of the American hierarchy to secure full diplomatic representation from this country at the Vatican . . ." (II, 412). But here, too, no proof of this "determination" is adduced.

The very lengthy chapter entitled, "The Church and Slavery" (II, 121-249), carries the reader through the Civil War. The only episode of note which the reviewer missed is one that would have interested Canon Stokes, namely, the expulsion in July, 1864, of William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, from his see city by the commander of the Union forces for not reading the prayer for the President of the United States. Elder was under practical arrest by the federal troops at Vidalia for a brief period, and this resistance to a command which the bishop thought went beyond the power of the military and his different appeals for redress to President Lincoln offer a good case study in wartime relations of the Church to the State.[9]

In the period after Appomattox there arose in the United States what has been called social Christianity, a movement wherein the churches began to sense more keenly their obligation to the cause of social reform and the betterment of the lot of the industrial masses. In the discussion of this question passing mention is made of the Catholic Church but one finds no treatment of the very real way in which the Church entered into this movement as the author might have ascertained from a work like that of Henry J. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington, 1949). In fact, one gets the impression in more than one place in these volumes that the narrative was written quite a long time before its publication and was not brought up to date. An example is the reference to "the new and authoritative life of Archbishop Hughes" (II, 405) to be published by Monsignor Guilday, although the monsignor died as long ago as July 31, 1947. Moreover, there is little by way of assess-

[9] The correspondence between Elder and the federal officials is given *in extenso* in Richard O. Gerow, *Cradle Days of St. Mary's at Natchez* (Natchez, 1941), pp. 145-184.

ment of the contribution made to social welfare by the numerous charitable institutions conducted under Catholic auspices. For example, in 1880 there were 373 such institutions maintained by private means and ten years later the number of these refuges for the poor, the sick, the aged and orphans had risen to 553.[10] In the action taken against the Louisiana lottery of the 1890's and public gambling in general (II, 297-304) no mention is made of the influential role played by Cardinal Gibbons against the Louisiana lottery in 1892, although Cardinal O'Connell is credited with helping to prevent legalization of lotteries in Massachusetts in 1941. The problems created for the churches by the Spanish-American War and the occupation of the Philippines receive due consideration (II, 311-322). Yet here the strenuous efforts made for peace before April 21, 1898, by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and the leading part they played in counseling the McKinley administration on post-war problems in the Catholic Philippines, would have added to the favorable aspects of Church-State relations during that brief conflict.[11]

Among the national issues discussed by the author as arising after the Civil War was that of what he terms "The Roman Catholic Adjustments to American Democracy." The subject is handled with the same general spirit of fairness which characterizes other sections of the work relating to American Catholicism. However, several minor points may be worthy of mention. It is not true to say that Archbishop Carroll was not very popular with Rome because, among other reasons, of "his friendly attitude toward Protestants" (II, 357). The first Archbishop of Baltimore, to be sure, had his differences on administrative matters with the Congregation of Propaganda Fide but the reviewer knows of no evidence that would indicate any dissatisfaction on the part of the Roman officials with Carroll by reason of his friendliness toward his non-Catholic fellow countrymen. Canon

[10] *Sadliers' Catholic Directory . . . 1880* (New York, 1880), p. xxii, and *Sadliers' Catholic Directory . . . 1890* (New York, 1890), p. 408. For a recent and fuller development of the Catholic contribution made to American charitable enterprises cf. Aaron I. Abell, "The Catholic Factor in Urban Relief: The Early Period, 1850-1880," *Review of Politics* XIV (July, 1952), 289-324.

[11] For the role of Ireland cf. John T. Farrell, "Archbishop Ireland and Manifest Destiny," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXIII (October, 1947), 269-301; "Background of the Taft Mission to Rome," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVI (April, 1950), 1-32; XXXVII (April, 1951), 1-22. On Gibbons, cf. Allen Sinclair Will, *Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (New York, 1922), II, 595-623.

Stokes has included here a very sympathetic account of the work of Cardinal Gibbons in his career as a leading American citizen (II, 363-369). The reviewer could well imagine that Gibbons might, indeed, have been an "inopportunist" on the question of defining the Pope's infallibility in 1870, but in all the material examined in preparation for the cardinal's biography he saw nothing that would warrant the statement that "he did doubt the wisdom of declaring it at that time" (II, 364). Major credit was, it is true, due to Gibbons for preventing the ban against the Knights of Labor from being applied to the United States in 1887, but he did not, as is said here, secure "the lifting of the ban against them in Canada" (II, 365). The author quite rightly emphasizes the love which the cardinal had for the United States as the land of his birth, but Gibbons would have considered that circumstance "the greatest good fortune of his life" (II, 369) only after the grace of his faith in the Catholic Church and his vocation to its priesthood.

The next chapter treats of the problems of church adjustment in the fields of racial and religious restrictions (II, 373-487). The prejudices that have operated in almost all walks of American life against minorities like the Jews, Negroes, and Catholics are all thoroughly canvassed, and the pages devoted to the movement of anti-Catholicism in the years after the Civil War are excellent. In that regard one or two observations may not be out of place. Dr. Stokes quotes one of the decrees of the Vatican Council defining the universal jurisdiction of the Pope in the government of the Church, to which he adds, "As long as this constitution stands the Roman Catholic Church in the United States cannot be a strictly self-governing body" (II, 396). The author's statement is certainly not incorrect, but it should be remarked that it was never intended that the Church in this country should be self-governing in the sense spoken of here. If it were to become strictly self-governing it would no longer be a part of the Catholic Church. Seven pages are given to the problem of the freedom of Ireland in American politics and the part which the Catholic Church played in that question (II, 414-421). The assignment of equal guilt to England and Ireland for the latter's miserable state in the nineteenth century (II, 414) is surely not fair to the Irish, and when Canon Stokes speaks of the Irish immigrant group of 1840-1870 coming to the United States "smarting under what it believed to be 'oppression' in Ireland as a result of Protes-

tant English rule . . ." (II, 415) he reveals little understanding of the abuse of English rule in Ireland in those terrible years of the potato famine and its aftermath. For that matter, many of the Irish were well aware that Catholic landlords were as oppressive as their Protestant counterparts. It is true that many of the American bishops of Irish birth or ancestry were enthusiastic for Irish home rule in 1918, but the leader of the American hierarchy at that time—Cardinal Gibbons—was one bishop who did not give himself "definitely and wholeheartedly" (II, 418) for the cause of Irish freedom. In fact, Gibbons was sufficiently reserved to bring criticism upon himself from some of the more extreme Irish enthusiasts.

When the author turns to the protection of coreligionists in other countries and speaks of Franco Spain, no one will dispute him when he says, "The case of Spain has caused special difficulties" (II, 446). But it is very doubtful if those difficulties are brought any nearer to solution by Canon Stokes. To the lonely position attributed to the *Commonweal* among American Catholic journals in advocating caution toward Franco there should be added the name of James M. Gillis, C.S.P., former editor of the *Catholic World,* who always took the Franco regime—as he had that of Mussolini—with great reserve. To speak of the following of the Spanish loyalists as "strong supporters of constitutional and administrative reform, popular rights, and religious liberty,"—while acknowledging the presence among them of anti-religious communists—and then, in turn, to characterize the supporters of Franco as "in general extremely conservative and 'respectable' Spaniards" who were out of sympathy with fundamental reforms and definitely anti-democratic (II, 446), is not to give an accurate and satisfactory alignment of the two sides. The present reviewer is no admirer of many features of the Franco government, nor does he subscribe in any way to the use of violence against Protestants in Spain or elsewhere in recent years. But he believes he is doing no injustice to the author of this work in stating that his single lengthy paragraph on the subject sheds little real light on he Spanish situation.

Under another aspect of the problems of racial and religious minorities and their relation to national unity there are listed six organizations which, in the author's opinion, have been of assistance. Among them one finds, of course, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which has made a serious effort since 1928 to lessen religious and racial tension. But when one notes the Protestants and Other Ameri-

cans United for Separation of Church and State as the next name in the list he may be pardoned if he inquires how that organization has earned a place among those groups which have been devoting their effort to protecting minorities and attaining national unity (II, 456). The solid accomplishments of various Protestant groups in behalf of interracial justice are described in this section but no mention is made of the similar work of the Catholic Interracial Council. Even more important, the 455 Catholic churches in predominantly Negro communities of the United States served by 637 priests with 329 schools enrolling 72,554 pupils, taught by hundreds of devoted religious, are a silent yet tremendous contribution which is being made by the Catholic Church to the welfare of the American Negro that should not be ignored.[12] The discussion on minority needs and the adjustment of the American churches to them closes with political Zionism as a national issue (II, 471-487). Dr. Stokes treats the case from the time of the Balfour Declaration for a Jewish national homeland in November, 1917, through the ensuing divisions of American Jewry over an independent home for its people down to and beyond the recognition of the new State of Israel. Incidentally, the warm reception given by President Wilson in August, 1918, to the Balfour Declaration that the British government would use its good offices to bring about a homeland in Palestine for the Jews (II, 477), was in striking contrast to the attitude the President took about six months later in regard to another British responsibility, namely, Ireland. In the latter case he was distinctly unfriendly to the cause of Irish home rule and in a declaration before the members of the peace commission at Paris in March, 1919, he made that quite clear.[13]

The balance of Volume II is devoted to two very lengthy chapters on the problems of Church-State adjustment in the field of public and private education (II, 488-758). Insofar as the American public school is concerned the viewpoint of the author may best be summarized in his own words:

> It is realized that the public school in a democracy is almost necessarily a secular institution, being intended for pupils of all religious groups.

[12] *Our Negro and Indian Missions. Annual Report of the Secretary of the Commission for the Catholic Missions among the Colored People and the Indians* (Washington, 1952), p. 23. The Catholic Church also maintains 406 churches served by 222 priests and sixty-one schools for 8,107 children among the 100,722 Indian Catholics in the United States (*ibid.*, p. 33).

[13] Stephen Bonsal, *Unfinished Business* (London, 1944), p. 138.

This however does not and should not imply that it is irreligious, and a people with our background should not permit it to become antireligious. Indeed, every such school should show its sympathy with a spiritual outlook that involved recognition of the existence of God as the Creator of the world and of men, and the Judaeo-Christian teaching of our duty to Him and to our neighbor (II, 493-494).

The vast accumulation of data that follows attempts to show from history and from the interpretations of recent court cases involving religion in the public schools the way in which Canon Stokes believes his aims may be accomplished. But at the very outset he is involved in a dilemma which he is not able to resolve. If one is to take the McCollum decision of 1948 as the final word on the subject, as Dr. Stokes seems to wish (II, 515-523), then his hope that the public school will show its sympathy with a spiritual outlook involving the "recognition of the existence of God" will not stand, for Mrs. McCollum, a professed atheist, will not tolerate such recognition in the public school attended by her son. Moreover, to plead as the author does, for a recognition in public education of the value of religion and then to advance in its behalf "the collective value of culture" of John Dewey (II, 497) is of no help to the argument. There was no American educationist of the twentieth century who did more to accomplish the annihilation of the supernatural element in education than Dewey, and to cite one of the prime pragmatists of our age in this connection is, to say the least, incongruous. On this subject the author makes good use of many reliable sources of information, but the reader who has more than a passing acquaintance with Conrad Henry Moehlman's *School and Church: The American Way* (New York, 1944) is not going to have his confidence in Canon Stokes' critical acumen strengthened by his use of a book which is vitiated by so strong an anti-Catholic bias.

Canon Stokes welcomes the McCollum decision as one that, he says, "represented a step forward in supporting the Church-State separation and religious freedom clauses of the Constitution, though interpreting separation somewhat too rigorously" (II, 522). He quotes a report of the National Education Association made in 1949 as to what happened to the religious education programs in 2,639 public school systems as a result of this decision, and it was found that 11.8 per cent of those replying had given up their programs and of these 52.3 per cent did so by reason of the McCollum decision

(II, 529). The author is aware of the implications of this action upon the future religious education of American youth, but the alternatives which he offers are not very promising in the light of past experience, and it is to be feared that little consolation will be derived from the statement that some more efficient method must be adopted by the churches to reach the great majority of youth in the public schools (II, 534). Dr. Stokes has apparently no serious misgivings about the contradictions in which the Supreme Court involved itself in the various cases relating to the Jehovah's Witnesses (II, 600-616), and he is seemingly unimpressed by the applicability to the McCollum case of March 8, 1948, of the language of Justice Felix Frankfurter and his colleagues in the Gobitis case of June, 1940. In the latter it was stated, "Judicial nullification of legislation cannot be justified by attributing to the framers of the Bill of Rights views for which there is no historic warrant" (II, 610). If Canon Stokes believes the Supreme Court's decision in June, 1943, in reversing its own decision of three years before on the salute to the flag of the Jehovah's Witnesses to be "an important milestone in the history of religious liberty" (II, 614), one might ask why he feels the McCollum decision should be regarded as so irrevocable.

In this connection a recent contribution to the official journal of the American Bar Association has some pertinence. There it was stated that on January 15, 1951, the Supreme Court unanimously held in *Niemotko vs. Maryland* that religious ministers had the right by reason of the first and fourteenth amendments to equal protection of the law to preach religion on consecutive Sundays in a tax-supported recreational park without the customary permit from the city. On the same day the Supreme Court in an eight to one decision in the case of *Kunz vs. New York* stated that a religious minister could preach in Columbus Circle in New York City, which is tax-supported property, without the ordinance required by the city, and this again on the strength of his rights under the first and fourteenth amendments. Moreover, the minister would be in no way impeded from using insulting language of other religious groups, for example, in declaring that "the Pope is the Anti-Christ, etc."[14] In the latter case Justice Robert H. Jackson, the sole dissenter, asked if the court

[14] T. Raber Taylor, "Equal Protection of Religion: Today's Public School Problem," *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 277.

had so quickly forgotten one of the chief reasons for prohibiting released time for religious instruction was that the Constitution would not allow tax-supported properties to be used to propagate religion. "How can the Court now order use of tax-supported property for the purpose?" Jackson asked, and he further inquired, "In other words, can the First Amendment today mean a city cannot stop what yesterday it meant no city could allow?"[15] In the light of these precedents and of the questionable interpretation used in the McCollum case—which Dr. Stokes himself admits in another connection (III, 564)—it is not at all certain that the Supreme Court will adhere to its own extreme position of 1948 on the separation of Church and State. The six to three decision of March 3, 1952, by which the Supreme Court declined to assume jurisdiction in the case of Bible reading in the public schools of New Jersey, and the favorable decision by the same alignment handed down on April 28, 1952, in the released time of the New York public schools would both point in the direction of a more moderate interpretation than that of 1948. In fact, one is justified in concluding from *Doremus vs. Board of Education* that today the court is less eager to entertain "wall of separation" controversies than it was in 1947-1948. When one reads the demands of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism as formulated by the author (III, 594) and realizes that the McCollum decision was a victory for this group more than any other, he is saddened to find a man of Canon Stokes' undoubted religious faith giving comfort to an association which would destroy the finest traditions upon which the American Republic is founded.

As regards parochial schools, Canon Stokes has many generous things to say concerning their contribution to the moral and spiritual betterment of their students, and through them to American society in general. He summarizes the pros and cons of parochial schools in the form of nine assertions made in their behalf by their supporters as against nine assertions made against them by their opponents (II, 659-660). This is surely a fair enough method to use, but a difficulty arises from the fact that with a single exception no authorities are cited for either group, and it is impossible, therefore, to tell whether or not the unnamed supporters and opponents of parochial schools are qualified to pass judgment on them. There are certain propositions

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

set forth as arguments against the parochial schools which, in the opinion of this reviewer, are not justified. For example, it is said that the teaching in such schools is apt to be dominated by theological and ecclesiastical authoritarianism, that they devote so much time to matters theological, ecclesiastical, and religious as to crowd out modern studies, that their superiors object so much to state inspection and standardization that state laws are likely to go by default, and that they tend to present American history inaccurately by reason of overemphasizing Catholic contributions and minimizing the contributions of non-Catholics in the national story. When an American Catholic reads these strictures he is fully warranted in asking: who is talking and how well qualified is he to speak on this subject? Any person well informed on the American Catholic parochial system will regard a number of these criticisms as hardly more than caricatures. And when the sole authority cited for the manner in which Catholic schools teach American history is found to be a letter from Professor William Warren Sweet of Southern Methodist University to the author and articles by the same professor in the *Christian Advocate* of June, 1922, his confidence in the accuracy of the judgments is not going to be strengthened. Professor Sweet has little real knowledge of what goes on in Catholic classrooms, and in many of the things he has written about American Catholicism he has proved himself to be a quite unsafe guide. An instance of the approach of Professor Sweet to matters affecting American Catholicism may be cited from a book he published five years ago. He commented on the growing strength and assertiveness of the Church in the United States and he noted that since 1918 there had been produced at the Catholic University of America over fifty doctoral dissertations in American Catholic history. Most of these he characterized as "historically sound," to which there was appended the qualification that "practically all have been censored by the church. This fact in the eyes of outside historians renders them somewhat suspect. For censored history must be classed as propaganda, even though it may display much sound scholarship."[16] A man who has so badly misunderstood the true meaning of the ecclesiastical *imprimatur* which appears on many Catholic books—although information on the *imprimatur* is readily

[16] William Warren Sweet, *The American Churches. An Interpretation* (New York, 1947), pp. 94-95.

available to him—is scarcely the proper person to judge the quality of American Catholic historiography. If in his own field of history such a blindness in matters Catholic is evident, Professor Sweet certainly eliminates himself as an authority on the procedures and methods used in the Catholic parochial schools. Dr. Stokes' assertion that enrollment in Catholic elementary schools has "remained about the same during the past two decades" (II, 655) is a gross error in fact in the light of the statistics in the annual volumes of the *Catholic Directory* for the past twenty years and the even more enlightening survey of Benjamin Fine published in the *New York Times* of March 30, 1952. It is likewise untrue that Catholics have used the term "godless" of the public schools in the sense that the majority of the teachers in those schools do not believe in God (I, 661). It has been due to the lack of religious instruction that such a term has at times been employed by some of the more extreme exponents of religious education in Catholic ranks.

Throughout the entire section on the schools the canon insists again and again upon the necessity of strict adherence to a rigid separation of the public schools from any church connection in the spirit of the McCollum decision and, although acknowledging the contribution which parochial schools have made to American life, he is equally insistent that they be given no financial support from the State. After remarking that these schools have been almost entirely supported from private sources, the author concludes with this judgment: "If this continues to be policy and the few cases of state aid are eliminated, there will be more general appreciation by non-Catholics of the contributions which the Catholics are making to general education" (II, 733). In other words, it would seem the appreciation of the contribution of the Church's schools will not be based upon their intrinsic worth in promoting the national welfare, but will be measured by their remoteness from public financial assistance!

This review article has already gone beyond a reasonable length and, therefore, no more can be done than to indicate in a very general way the rich content of Volume III and to give a few examples of further judgments which, in the opinion of the reviewer, are open to question. Under the heading of adjustments in social-legislative questions marriage problems are discussed, and here it might be stated that the regulations governing the celebration of mixed marriages in rectories or private homes no longer hold in many American dioceses

and such marriages are now being performed in the churches (III, 54). It is disappointing to find a man of Canon Stokes' breadth and general fairness repeating the old and misleading statement that Catholics who win annulments of marriage "are frequently people of important position who are able to exert much influence in Rome" (III, 65) when annually the Catholic press carries a summary of the cases decided by the Rota which often shows half or more have been decided without even a fee for the court expenses. No one will deny that the question of birth control is, as the author says, difficult and complicated (III, 78), but to those who hold to the tradition of the natural law on the sanctity of human life there are eternal principles involved in this question which they try to defend objectively in the face of the emotional agitation of Margaret Sanger and her followers. In regard to chaplains in hospitals and other public institutions, nothing is said of the bitter struggle fought throughout a good part of the nineteenth century in many parts of the United States to keep Catholic priests out, or of the fact that they only won entry by long and persistent efforts to reach their spiritual charges in those institutions. Canon Stokes finds it "questionable" that the Waco, Texas, chapter of the National Council of Catholic Women should have sponsored the move by the Mayor of Waco in 1941 to issue a special proclamation giving official recognition to Good Friday on the grounds that such "might cause pain to many thoughtful Jewish citizens" (III, 199). Catholic observance of Good Friday is motivated solely by reverence for the day of Christ's death on the cross and has no relation whatever to the fact that it was the Jews who had condemned Him to death. If such an interpretation is put on the observance, then President Truman must have used equally questionable methods in issuing his suggestion that government clerks in Washington be free from twelve to three o'clock on last Good Friday, April 11, 1952. In this section the Legion of Decency receives high appreciation from the author for its work in censoring films (III, 236-239).

To the subject of World War I and the peace movement Dr. Stokes devotes a lengthy chapter (III, 252-365). In outlining the attitude pursued by the American churches toward the League of Nations, World Court, and other post-war international institutions no mention is made of Cardinal Gibbons' strong support of a league and of universal military training, two subjects on which he earned the

gratitude of government officials along with the criticisms of other citizens who were opposed to these measures. When he comes to World War II and American participation therein the author is quite correct in saying that many American Catholics were "somewhat embarrassed" by the fact that the Russian communists were our allies, but it is a trifle absurd to suggest that they experienced any embarrassment from the official neutrality of the Holy See and of Ireland (III, 288). The reviewer has never met an American Catholic who was in the least embarrassed in the support he gave to World War II by reason of these factors. Catholics responded with the customary patriotism that has always marked their answer to the call of duty in the wars of their country and, in fact, among the 1,488 conscientious objectors tabulated here (III, 300) only twenty-nine, the smallest number for any single denomination, were Catholics. If the Catholic Church of the United States revealed deep uneasiness over the problem of Soviet Russia and the advance of communism during and after World War II, time has proved that it had ample warrant, and the attitudes of some of the American Protestant churches as revealed here have been shown to have been pitifully unrealistic (III, 356-364).

There are three chapters which deal respectively with the legal basis of church property, clergy rights, and Church-State relations, with the status in this country of religion in general, and with that of Christianity in particular (III, 369-626). These carry Canon Stokes up to the final section of his monumental work where he draws some over-all conclusions. In these three chapters the decisions of the courts are examined in all cases relating to important Church-State matters, and the attitudes of the various churches toward the State, social reform, and religious freedom are once more canvassed. In analyzing the present attitude of the Catholic Church toward the State and religious freedom Dr. Stokes finds much to encourage him in his laudable desire for harmony and understanding between the two institutions. But he likewise believes that recent years have shown some "disquieting signs" in the form of the general support by the American hierarchy of General Franco and the opposition to the recognition of what he calls "the Republican Loyalists in Spain" (III, 466). Yet nothing is said of the fact that the hierarchy's opposition to the latter was due mainly to the fact that they were inspired and led by communists who had determined upon the complete de-

struction of all forms of supernatural religion and of Catholicism in particular. In any case, these matters relating to the hierarchy's policies give no reasonable basis for the fear of some unnamed Protestant leaders that the United States may witness "the development here of a counter-Reformation" (III, 466).

While Canon Stokes may approve the statement of Benedetto Croce on Church and State, it is incorrectly characterized as that of "a liberal European Catholic point of view" (III, 662) since the works of Croce are on the *Index of Prohibited Books* and may not, therefore, pass for Catholic in any true sense. The excellent suggestion of courses in American colleges and universities on the subject of American Church-State relations as a means to a better understanding of the complexities involved has been met in part in several institutions since Canon Stokes' correspondence with Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. (III, 687-688), for in the academic year 1950-1951 Francis J. Powers, C.S.V., of the Department of Politics offered a course in the Catholic University of America which was entitled "Church and State in the United States," and in 1951-1952 the School of Law of Columbia University also offered a seminar in the legal and religious aspects of American Church-State relations. Speaking of the influence of American religious freedom on other nations, Canon Stokes cites the adoption by France in September, 1791, of religious freedom as a principle (III, 689). But it should have been added that France failed to follow the example of the United States in practice when it drew up and put into force in August, 1790, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy which allowed little freedom to the Church to conduct its own affairs. In enumerating some of the areas of the world where limits to religious freedom still exist it is odd, to say the least, to find Spain and Peru included because of compulsory Mass in the army and the schools, and no mention made of the restrictions imposed by Soviet Russia and its satellites (III, 696). And if the Catholics of Scandinavia were to read that not many decades have passed since a dominant Protestantism made it difficult for them to practice their religion "with full freedom" (III, 697), they would remind the author that such is still the case, even though some concessions have been recently granted.

Apart from questions of content something should be said concerning Canon Stokes' methods of research. He deserves the highest praise for the thoroughness with which he has gone through a moun-

tain of printed literature on the subject of Church-State relations. It was a formidable undertaking and only a man with the greatest perseverance and industry could have seen it to the end. Moreover, readers will aways be grateful to the canon for assembling in one place the results of his extensive reading and the hundreds of pertinent quotations with which his volumes are filled. There were, however, a number of times when this reviewer felt that material might well have been omitted as, e.g., on the Swiss Confederation (I, 127-129), on duelling (II, 5-12), but more especially the largely repetitious Chapter XXVI (III, 645-697) which goes over again ground that had already been covered. The exceedingly lengthy quotations at times slow down reading interest and produce a certain tedium, although they do enhance the value of the work as a source book. On another point of method, the reviewer cannot agree that the reader would be "embarrassed by notes in the text" (I, xl), since these volumes were intended in the main for serious students and not for the popular reading public. For the former the presence of footnotes at the bottom of the pages is never an embarrassment.

It would be unreasonable, to be sure, to expect that the author of a work of this kind should in all cases seek out manuscript sources for his information, but the way in which certain printed sources are handled leaves much to be desired. For example, it is not good practice to take statements such as that from the *Civiltà cattolica* of 1948 by way of the *Christian Century* of June 23 of that year (I, 18, 885). Nor is it very helpful to be told that a recent unnamed writer has stated that "all political problems are at bottom theological" (I, 701), and then find that the footnote reads: "Cf. his *The Theology of Politics*, and Quick, O.C., *Christianity and Justice, passim*" (I, 926). In like manner critical readers will not be reassured to find a quotation from the readily available *American Ecclesiastical Review* (II, 464) on Catholic participation in the National Conference of Christians and Jews resting on a reference to Paul Blanshard and a statement of "some bishops in *Commonweal*, July 14, 1944" (II, 783). In the same category is the use of a letter on chaplaincies in the *Commonweal* of April 16, 1943 (III, 732) relating to the service of Abbé François Louis de Lotbinère as a chaplain with the American forces of Benedict Arnold in Canada (III, 111). Here a work like Aidan H. Germain, O.S.B., *Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains, 1776-1917* (Washington, 1939) would have served much better. The quotation

of the statement on Church and State of one who is identified only as "a well-known Jesuit" (III, 451) from the *Christian Century* of December 31, 1947 (III, 750) is a further instance of this unsatisfactory method of documentation. To discuss a case like that of the sisters teaching in the public school of Dixon, New Mexico, and the controversy that ensued over them in 1947 is entirely pertinent in a work of this character (II, 668-671). But to draw one's sources altogether from the *Christian Herald,* the *Christian Century,* and the *Churchman,* three Protestant journals, is to hear only one side in the dispute.

But far more serious in revealing the author's lack of critical appraisal of his sources is his characterization of Blanshard's *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (Boston, 1949), as "an able but somewhat extreme presentation" (III, 480) of the position of Catholics in relation to Church and State. Dr. Stokes would not have needed to await the appearance of James M. O'Neill's *Catholicism and American Freedom* (New York, 1952) with its detailed exposure of Blanshard's shoddy scholarship to discover the crippling bias under which that author writes on any subject pertaining to American Catholicism. Although we are told that Blanshard's one-sided selection of evidence and unsympathetic interpretations produce an overall effect that "is not wholly fair," yet Canon Stokes maintains that Blanshard's facts on the history of the Church, its canon law, and traditions are "basically sound" (III, 778). Just how a man's facts can be "basically sound" if they are selected to sustain his prejudice and to which, in turn, he gives an "unsympathetic interpretation" is a mystery that is best left for Canon Stokes to solve! Then, too, the canon was not happy in his choice of Albert Houtin, *l'Américanisme* (Paris, 1904) as the basis for his treatment of the American Catholic school controversy of the 1890's (III, 473-474). This book by an apostate French priest was no source for a topic of this kind, especially when the author had at his command two able monographs done from original sources, namely, Daniel F. Reilly, O.P., *The School Controversy, 1891-1893* (Washington, 1943), and Patrick H. Ahern, *The Catholic University of America. The Rectorship of John J. Keane, 1887-1896* (Washington, 1949). In fairness to Canon Stokes due allowance must be made for the fact that he was beset by tremendous problems in making his way through hundreds of books and periodicals and in keeping in order his thousands of footnotes.

That some awkward spots should fail to be ironed out and some bibliographical errors turn up was inevitable. But the uncritical use made of a number of items in his bibliography is more serious and it is this which in the final analysis will tell more heavily against the enduring value of the work.

The reviewer trusts that he has made clear the appreciation which he feels for the general fairness—even if not unmottled by his own ideological blind spots—which has informed the impressive accomplishment of Canon Stokes in these three volumes. He would sincerely regret if the strictures which he has felt compelled to pass upon certain phases of the work should cause any reader of this journal to neglect the opportunity which he will find here for enriching his knowledge of American religious history. In this sense the reviewer cannot do better by way of conclusion than to express the hope that his criticisms may be interpreted in the spirit which has marked the tone of the pages he has criticized, and that nothing he has said will be out of harmony with the concluding judgment on *Church and State in the United States* as expressed in the *Times Literary Supplement* on November 9, 1951, where it was stated:

> In a field of learning soaked in all uncharitableness, even to-day, it is a great achievement to have written so long and so learned a book, of which every page seeks to see and show the best in men and sects and whose author always remembers that the great need in all religious discussion is charity.

Dr. Stokes has expressed the hope that he may publish a brief condensation of these three volumes for popular consumption, and since he states that he will welcome corrections (I, lxix) the following slips on Catholic items are offered with a view to being of help in that regard.

Volume I: Don Sturzo was born in 1871, not 1870 (p. 28); it is the Republic of Ireland, not the "Irish Free State" (p. 58); read "1755" for "1775" (p. 214); provincial "council" of 1840, not "councils" (p. 251); the address of the Continental Congress to the people of Great Britain was October 26, 1774, not October 24 (p. 262); read "Citizen" for "Citizens" for the French document of 1789 (p. 265); Archbishop Carroll died in 1815, not 1813 (p. 293); John England was never an "archbishop" (p. 324); Carroll was made an archbishop in 1808, not 1811 (p. 326); Bishop England was born in

1786, not 1788 (p. 502); moreover, he preached at Christmas, 1825, in St. Patrick's Church, Washington, not St. Matthew's, as the latter was opened only in 1840 (p. 503); John Hughes was a bishop, not an archbishop in 1847 (p. 505); Pennsylvania is said to have ratified the Constitution in December, 1787, by a vote of forty-six to twenty-three (p. 601) and by a majority of fifteen (p. 606); there was no "Bishop of Louisiana and the Floridas" at New Orleans in 1815; it was William Dubourg, administrator of the see (p. 687); James II came to the English throne in 1685, not 1684 (p. 785); one speaks of "a" congregation of cardinals, not "the" congregation (p. 790); Bedini was an archbishop, not a cardinal, on his visit to the United States in 1853 (p. 817); Hughes was a priest and not an archbishop in 1833 at the time of the debate with Breckenridge (p. 819), and he was made an archbishop in 1850, not 1847 (p. 825); read "J." M. O'Neill, not "I." M. (p. 910, n. 24).

Volume II: The lottery cited from Guilday's *Carroll* was for Holy Trinity School, Philadelphia, and not "a Roman Catholic parochial school in Baltimore" (p. 26); the *Freeman's Journal* of New York was begun in 1840, not 1839 (p. 32); Bedini was nuncio to Brazil in 1853, not to the United States (p. 90); Brownson was converted in 1844, not 1842 (p. 188); James Gibbons was nineteen, not eighteen, when he returned to the United States (p. 363), and on the same page the Second Plenary Council was held in 1866, not 1868, and Gibbons was thirty-four and not thirty-two when he was made a bishop; Gibbons was named coadjutor of Baltimore in 1877, not 1875, and his *Faith of Our Fathers* was published in 1876, not 1875 (p. 364). On page 365 the cardinal's Milwaukee sermon was delivered in 1891, not 1899, and the petition to Rome concerning German grievances was made by Father Peter Abbelen of Milwaukee and not by Missouri Catholic Germans, although Abbelen's case related in part to conditions in Missouri. The celebration in Baltimore in June, 1911, was in honor of Cardinal Gibbons' golden jubilee as a priest and silver jubilee as a cardinal (p. 368); read National Catholic Welfare Conference, and not "Council" (p. 381; III, 470, 472), and National Conference of Christians and Jews, not "Jews and Christians" (p. 391); Pius IX's reign was from 1846 to 1878, not 1848-1871 (p. 393). Great Britain has no "diplomatic interchange" with the Vatican (p. 412) since the representative of the Holy See in London is Archbishop William Godfrey who is an apostolic dele-

gate, not a nuncio; there is no such thing as the "Catholic Social Welfare Council" (pp. 414, 378-379); what is meant is likely the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine's edition of the Old Testament cannot be spoken of as having "been issued since" (p. 566) as its first books are scheduled for publication only this fall. Francesco Satolli was an archbishop, not a cardinal on his visit to the United States in 1892 (p. 652); Dr. Edward McGlynn died in 1900, not 1899 (p. 653). The Archdiocese of Washington was erected on July 29, 1939, and not in 1948; an Archbishop of Washington was named on November 27, 1947, not 1948, and he is "chancellor" and not "rector" of the Catholic University of America (p. 662 n.). The convent inspection bill in Massachusetts came in 1855, not "shortly before 1850" (p. 737); Cardinal Spellman was born in 1889, not 1887 (p. 744); and the date of the letter of King to Seward was 1867, not 1887 (p. 764, n. 310).

Volume III: Benedict XV's letter to the American hierarchy was dated April 10, 1919, not April 19 (p. 11); for "Amieto" read "Amleto" in the first name of the Apostolic Delegate to the United States (p. 12); *Rerum novarum* was published in 1891, not 1899; Elizabeth Seton died in 1821, not 1810, and it is not so clear that it was she who established "the first completely free parochial school" in the United States (p. 33); mention is made of four Catholic chaplains as having served in the Mexican War at the top of page 112 and the number is given as three at the bottom of the same page; the Second Plenary Council was held in 1866, not 1870 (p. 411); Thomas Bouquillon's work on education was a pamphlet, not a book, and John J. Keane was then a bishop, not a monsignor (p. 473); the expression in regard to the papal letter on the Fairbault-Stillwater schools was "tolerari posse," not "tolerari possi" (p. 474); it was forty-one years from Dr. Stokes' publication date for Cardinal Gibbons' article in the *North American Review* of March, 1909, not "a quarter of a century ago" (p. 646); the New York Catholic paper was the *Freeman's Journal*, not the *Freedman's Journal* (p. 752, n. 97).

*The Catholic University of America*

# BOOK REVIEWS

## GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

*Benediktinisches Mönchtum in Oesterreich. Eine Festschrift der oesterreichischen Benediktinerkloester.* Edited by Hildebert Tausch, O.S.B. (Wien: Verlag Herder. 1949. Pp. xii, 342. DM 9.80.)

This volume contains twenty-four well rounded articles, all written in a scholarly manner by thirteen members of the Austrian Benedictine family in commemoration of the 1400th anniversary of St. Benedict's death. Organized into four main sections, they deal with the history of the order, its past and present activities, the organization of its staff and co-workers, and lastly its character as well as main objectives in Austria. Abbot Springer refers in his preface to a paper, published in 1947 by Professor Triebel and entitled, "Oesterreich-ein Gebilde benediktinischen Geistes." Indeed, this little country with at least a nominal Catholic population of ninety-one percent, a remnant of a vast and polyglot central-European organization, owes a good deal of its particular charm and vitality to the vestige of Benedictine doctrines of harmony. There are still fifteen abbeys of the Benedictine monks in Austria. Three of them (St. Peter, Michelbeuren, Kremsmuenster) were founded between 700 and 800; ten more look proudly back to the high Middle Ages. Even the later secularized mind was for centuries shaped with the active contribution of many Benedictine educators and teachers. Thus the gorgeous splendor and the perfect beauty of religious services and rites, together with the devoted observance of time-honored traditional customs, were bound to make its indelible imprint on minds and habits of the people.

Small wonder that St. Benedict's order and its work shared the ups and downs of historic events that often enough shattered this European heartland along the Danube River between the Alps and the Hungarian prairies, a region which was to become one of the centers of a widely German-speaking Christian civilization. More than once the Benedictines were near to the abyss. Every Benedictine archive is in a position to supply valuable material for the student of the Thirty Years' War, the eastern menace (Turks), the Josephist period with its meachanistic ideals of oversimplifying the ideology of reform. Goettweig (near Vienna) remembers the day when Napoleon on horseback climbed the monumental staircase leading to the showroom of the abbey. All but three of the monasteries were dissolved under Hitler, only to resume after liberation in 1945 their work where they had been stopped seven years before. Four of the most important abbeys are now located in the Russian zone of occupation and one more, Schotten, is in isolated Vienna with all the implications

involved for a not yet entirely clear future. But the Austrian Benedictines remained what they had been for centuries, the most faithful, loyal, pious, and ardent guardians of what is called the Austrian baroque in its most sublime meaning.

Professor Carl J. Friedrich's interesting and inspiring recent study, *The Age of the Baroque, 1610-1660* (New York, 1952), cannot possibly do full justice to this era. The Austrian and south German baroque produced many of their most precious jewels during the period which followed the devastations of the Thirty Years' War. Moreover, it seems questionable to this reviewer whether one can ever get at a fair appreciation and understanding of the baroque when neglecting its basically Catholic origin, and herewith its original score and meaning. Thus the different articles of the volume under review offer to an interested reader an almost indispensable supplement which might help him to correct sometimes misleading judgments regarding the *barocco*. The publication of the Austrian Benedictines, though unpretentious, is an impressive and searching account which covers a good deal of pioneer work accomplished for a certain purpose, which was service to God and man; using, developing, and adjusting a certain style which, though by no means exclusively Benedictine (viz., the term "Jesuit-Style"), in certain countries became a symbol of Benedictine culture surviving to the present day, the baroque. It stands for unity and harmony between know-how and why; knowledge and faith; physics and metaphysics; it gives proud evidence of *Romanitas* (Virgil Redlich) in its noblest and supra-national form, combined with German strength of expression, always eager to serve God by promoting most refined, truly humanistic ideals. Papers like Redlich's discussion of the Benedictine University of Salzburg (1623-1810) are certainly valuable contributions for a better understanding of baroque style and baroque man, their typical way of life and thinking. This reviewer hardly remembers having ever read a better commentary and interpretation of baroque rhetoric—and this holds true even for one fairly acquainted with the techniques of Abraham a Santa Clara—than that offered by Redlich in reference to the funeral sermon delivered by the Benedictine Professor Count Preysing in 1643 on the occasion of the rites for the deceased Bishop Christoph from Chiemsee. This certainly would not be fit reading for an adept of mediocre modern political oratory; the possible outcome could easily be a deplorable display of good taste. But this is what usually happened with copies and imitations of genuine baroque. Hence its widespread discredit. It would not make sense, indeed, to concentrate on the foam of an overflowing seventeenth-century cup, artificially preserved for spectacular purposes, when its real effervescent contents, the originally precious, intoxicating stuff had evaporated at least five generations before. Only one who had lost track of its original meaning may

be satisfied with cheap definitions like baroque as the make-believe style, or the manner of grotesque preference for odd exaggerations.

But it is not only information about past history which is offered by this scholarly study of the Austrian Benedictines. It gives as well a fair survey of their present activities and concerns. By 1947 seven abbeys had reopened their formerly renowned secondary schools, mostly of the humanistic type with strong accent given to the classical languages. Other abbeys concentrated on smaller boarding schools and vocational institutions of practical learning. And by the same year 1,300 students had registered compared with about 1,800 in 1938. Besides their activity in the educational field the order is in charge of about 200 incorporated parishes, retreat houses, and similar institutions. The total number amounted in 1947 to 466 ordained monks, eighty-eight lay brothers, and the conventuals of three sisters' communities (H. Tausch).

Of special interest are the reports of Abbot Hermann Peichl, Norbert Schachinger, and Sr. R. M. Spuller about the various activities in the vast field of social work. The former material wealth has gone, particularly the former large landed estates. One of the formerly richest abbeys (Schotten) retained agricultural holdings of about 400 acres, and more than 100 acres were distributed among small settlers during the period between the wars. There is, therefore, no further problem of land reform; as a matter of fact, there never was much of a problem on this score in the territory of present Austria. How thoroughly social consciousness permeates thinking and planning is clearly and soberly exposed in the article contributed by Abbot Peichl (Schotten). True, there are still innumerable treasures in libraries, archives, churches, and art collections, cherished and taken care of by Benedictine experts and communities. All of these are open to the public; they form an integral part of the country's unique cultural resources. It may be significant that one of the contributors to this work is the author of a two-volume standard Austrian history (H. Hantsch, O.S.B., professor in the Universities of Vienna, Styria, Graz, 1947). There are a few things that still cannot be transplanted, copied, or surpassed abroad because they live and die with their historic surroundings. Among them is this lucky combination of conservative action and progressive thought which is a central-European Benedictine abbey.

KURT VON SCHUSCHNIGG

*St. Louis University*

*The White Canons in England.* By H. M. Colvin. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 459. $7.00.)

The need for specialized monographs detailing the history of the religious orders in the high Middle Ages is being filled with unusual dispatch

and scholarship. The laborious examination of manuscript material may be remarked as the peculiar feature of these recent histories; certainly this is the pre-eminent characteristic of Mr. Colvin's history of the Premonstratensians in England.

The introductory chapter on the origins of the order in France and Germany adds very little to the literature on the subject. The attempt to trace the intellectual and religious ideas influencing Saint Norbert is not particularly convincing. Indeed, the stress placed on the organization of the order independently of and at variance with the spirit of Saint Norbert appears grossly overstated. In describing individually the establishment of some thirty Premonstratensian houses in England the author is more at home. The examination of every available manuscript in dating and locating the foundations and in following their temporal fortunes often to the dissolution is definitive. The evaluation of foundation gifts in terms of contemporary feudal life is itself a study in mediaeval economic organization. This lengthy chapter is the heart of the volume and from it stems the importance of the author's contribution.

The organization of general chapters and the authority of the Abbot of Prémontré over the houses of the order, particularly as it was adversely affected by papal and royal differences in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, is of special interest. However, the author's approach to the *Opus Dei* is, to say the least, arbitrary when he cavalierly omits all description of the *horarium* to concentrate on merely the individual suffrages rendered the public founders of a convent. Aside from the fact that the spiritual exercises are the *raison d'être* of a religious community and that all benefactors share in these prayers, a very false impression is almost inevitable from such a truncated presentation. As far as the rights of secular patrons and advocates over each abbey are concerned it appears that they were very real if somewhat intangible; certainly they were considerably less in the Premonstratensian Order than those enjoyed by patrons over other orders. The information in the chapters devoted to intellectual activities and nunneries is so slight as not to merit comment.

The nine appendixes are a fitting complement to the second chapter. A number of brief excerpts from original documents are printed. An estimation is made of the number of canons in each Premonstratensian abbey. The bibliography is arranged by houses, as is the list of manuscript sources. An annotated list of abbots, a number of corrections to *Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia,* and an excellent index together with several minor appendixes complete the volume.

It is apparent that Mr. Colvin attacks his work more from the point of view of an antiquarian than that of a social historian. It is ordinarily expected that an historian who has delved deeply into the sources should draw informed conclusions. For the most part the author declines to do

this, being content to dig out the pertinent data. This reticence in his case is a virtue, for on the few occasions in which he does indulge in generalization the results are something less than happy, e.g., the suggestion that periods of chaos and insecurity favored the founding of religious houses by lawless feudal lords (p. 27 ff.); the implication that the spread of the order was directly proportionate to the desire of each noble family to found a convent (p. 38); the conclusion that the differences between the English abbeys and Prémontré were "a demonstration in miniature of the forces which were bringing about the dissolution of Christendom itself" (p. 215)—and this in 1316!

This is not to say that Mr. Colvin has not produced a solid, carefully documented work; he has on the contrary laid the absolutely necessary, if unexciting, groundwork for the complete history of the Premonstratensians in England. It will remain an essential source for the writing of the definitive history of the White Canons in England.

ALBERT C. SHANNON

*Merrimack College*

*The Metropolitan Visitations of William Courteney, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1381-1396:* Documents transcribed from the original manuscripts of Courteney's Register. By Joseph Henry Dahmus. [Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Volume XXXI. No. 2.] (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1950. Pp. 209. $2.00 paper, $3.00 cloth.)

The need to edit mediaeval episcopal and archiepiscopal registers is a task which is not always fully recognized. Editions of this kind demand, on the one hand, rigorous editorial scholarship and, on the other, a thorough familiarity with the circumstances, localities, personalities, and other factors bearing upon the contents of the register thus edited. It was, therefore, wholly laudable that the registers of Archbishop Courteney have now been edited by one already known to readers of the REVIEW. Courteney was not only one of the outstanding characters of late mediaeval English ecclesiastical life, but also an archbishop who insisted on the archiepiscopal right of visitation of his province. Despite the sometimes vigorous protests on the part of his suffragans, Courteney visited the greater part of his province either personally or through commissaries. The register kept is a business-like account, and its edition is highly welcome, not only because it considerably widens our knowledge of the detailed ecclesiastical administration of such a vast province as Canterbury, but also because it affords one an insight into many circumstances which otherwise might have been committed to oblivion. The edition is preceded by a long, learned, most valuable, and interesting introduction by the editor.

Nevertheless, the execution of the editorial task leaves a good deal to be desired. For editions of registers, chronicles, cartularies, etc., a detailed index is indispensable; there is no index of the register in this edition. Even if the one or the other ecclesiastic or lay personality may not be of great importance in the present context, evidence of this kind is often extremely valuable in other directions, and may afford a clue to an unsolved riddle. But here the names of persons and localities lie buried within the body of the edition, hence lessening its value to research workers. One other equally grave defect of the present edition is that the editor in a number of places does not edit, but confines himself to the statement: "Listed are the names of those the archbishop ordained" (*scil.* in the course of a visitation); the same criticism must be levelled against his summarizing a number of Courteney's orders, or of certifications by addressees, or letters of appointment, without giving the text itself. From the diplomatic point of view the wisdom of omitting the actual documentary dating of the various mandates, injunctions, and commissions is open to doubt; it is, diplomatically speaking, not always sufficient when the editor gives us: "Dated at Chichester, 21 July 1388." From the same point of view it is regrettable that the inscriptions, salutations, etc., are omitted in most cases. It is true that the transcription of the purely formal elements of documents is tedious, but so is much other editorial business. Why are the witnesses and penal sanctions omitted? The editor does not always specify the contents of leaves which he does not transcribe, e.g., fol. 140v contains two entries, the next entry comes from fol. 142; what fol. 141 *recto* and *verso* contain we are not informed. It may be doubted whether it was advisable to include references to contemporary chronicles, records, and other evidence (contemporary and modern) in the editor's introduction—valuable as this is—instead of in a critical apparatus at the appropriate places of the edition itself.

It is very regrettable that the editor who devoted so much labor to, and bestowed so much love on, the otherwise excellent edition, should lay himself open to these easily rectifiable criticisms.

WALTER ULLMANN

*Trinity College*
*Cambridge*

*The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest.* By John Gerard. Translated from the Latin by Philip Caraman. (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy. 1952. Pp. xxiv, 287. $3.50.)

One night in November, 1588, Father John Gerard, a newly ordained Jesuit, landed quietly on the English coast to bring the consolations of the true religion to his persecuted countrymen. For eighteen years he led

the dangerous life of an outlawed priest until the catastrophe of the Gunpowder Plot made it impossible to continue his ministry. After escaping to the continent he wrote a Latin account of his missionary enterprises at his superior's request. This Latin original has been newly translated into English by Philip Caraman, S.J., under the title of *The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest.* The English version is so ably done that the narrative reads as smoothly as modern fiction. Father Caraman's task was made easier by the fact that Gerard was a true literary craftsman. With an artistic economy of phrase and a few deft strokes of his pen Gerard was able to sketch the character of the figures he encountered whether they were priests on the mission, the laity in their domestic pursuits, judges, jailers, pursuivants, or domestic servants.

During those eighteen years Gerard succeeded in administering the sacraments to hundreds of the Catholic gentry, reconciled to the faith many who had lapsed, and converted numbers from heresy. Frequently the houses where he stayed were searched without warning and he was hidden for days behind walls in cramped secret chambers. His accounts of these searches are as realistic and full of suspense as any contemporary thriller. Betrayed into prison, he spent more than three years in the Clink and in the Tower. His description of the torture in the Tower is spare yet overwhelmingly effective and his escape from the Tower keeps the reader breathless until the last moment.

This document gives an intimate picture of how Catholics paid for their faith during the last years of Elizabeth and the incipient reign of James I. One feels the greatest admiration not only for the martyrs who were so magnificent in their sufferings but also for the untold sacrifices offered by the recusants who risked fortune and life to shelter priests so that the faith might be kept alive in England.

Gerard was a priest of intense spirituality whose one regret was that God had not deemed him worthy of martyrdom. This book he wrote for his fellow Jesuits, especially for the novices whom he was directing, and at times his story appears overcharged with naive piety. The American reader may also be somewhat surprised by his frequent allusions to class distinctions. In the circumstances of his day it is understandable that his efforts were directed toward the Catholic gentry but his continual references to persons of quality, gentlemen, men of rank, good families demonstrate how very English he was. When this account was written, the persecution was still violently raging and it was necessary for Gerard to keep most of the Catholics who befriended him anonymous. Nearly all of these individuals have been identified by Father Caraman in his notes which are as interesting as they are valuable. The editor has, however, for "artistic effect" chosen to place the majority of these notes in the back of the book which historians will find annoying.

Ardently devoted to the Society of Jesus, Gerard wrote of the archpriest controversy as a quarrel between some "restless priests" and the Jesuits. In his preface Caraman defends this description; but dispassionate historians recognize that there was more behind this unfortunate dispute than a few "restless priests." Another subject that might have merited more detailed explanation in the notes is the matter of equivocation. The index is adequate and there is an enthusiastic introduction by Graham Greene.

HARRY C. KOENIG

*St. Mary of the Lake Seminary*
*Mundelein*

*Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century.* By E. T. Davies, Director of Education in the Diocese of Monmouth. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1950. Pp. vi, 137. 10/16.)

The purpose of this short work is to discuss three related problems in the history of the Church of England in the sixteenth century: the teaching of the official formularies of belief and of Anglican theologians on the nature of episcopacy; the effect of the declaration of the royal supremacy on this doctrine; and the various attempts then made to define the meaning and the implications of the supremacy itself. The sources used are the official formularies—the Ten Articles of 1536, the Bishops' Book of 1537, the King's Book of 1543, and the various forms of the Articles of the Church of England—and the interpretation of these formularies in the works of the Anglican "fathers," Cranmer, Jewel, Whitgift, Bancroft, Saravia, Bilson, and Hooker, these last representing, as the author rightly says, "a territory which has been strangely and sadly neglected by students."

Mr. Davies starts from the viewpoint that there was no break in continuity in the English Church at the Reformation—"The Church of England is heir to the whole Catholic tradition, as well as to the Protestant reformation." Unfortunately, in support of this statement he does no more than quote the judgment of a Unitarian minister. It is, in fact, the fundamental weakness of this work that it contains no attempt whatever to discuss the origins and development of the reform movement in England, or to relate the discussion of points of doctrine to the actual course of events, to what the author refers to as "the peculiar historical circumstances of the sixteenth century." So, for example, it is argued that, while the supremacy represented a constitutional revolution in the Church, it was, nevertheless, necessary and was, therefore, a true measure of re-

form. But this, surely, is to ignore the fact that the initiative in this movement was entirely due to the king; that the supremacy as conceded by the bishops in 1531 was a result of royal pressure; that they inserted a saving clause which in their minds nullified its effect; that in the Act of Supremacy of 1534 this clause was omitted and a new form of royal supremacy imposed by the will of the king alone; and that in 1559 the bishops—including the "Henricians"—resisted this doctrine almost to a man, and were for their resistance deprived and imprisoned.

It is much the same with the claim that the act imposing the supremacy had no doctrinal implications, that its object was simply "to preserve the purity of doctrine, without any claim to define doctrine." But, according to the terms of this act, the king assumed "full power and authority" to redress and reform "errors, heresies, abuses." If the king, in virtue of the powers he thus arrogated to himself, claimed the right to declare what was not orthodox doctrine, he was in effect deciding on his own authority what his subjects might and might not believe. And when, two years later, the Ten Articles, the first official formulary of belief, appeared, the title of the document made it clear that these articles were to be attributed to the king himself, since they were "devised by the king's majesty"—a thing, as Reginald Pole remarked, "of which it is difficult to say whether it be more foolish or impious." Nor can it be doubted that in the publication and acceptance of the articles, it was the king's will, and not any alleged approval of the clergy, which was the deciding factor.

Mr. Davies finds it "impossible to say what the Church itself . . . believed and taught about episcopacy." On this subject there were, for half a century, opinions but no doctrine. Not until the last decade of the century and the work of Hooker was there any generally accepted Anglican teaching on this point; and even then it seems to be far from clear whether Hooker believed the powers of the bishops to rest on anything more than divine approbation of a secular appointment. It is surely not without significance that this "emergence of modern Anglicanism," as the author calls it, took place precisely at a time when the authority of the crown in England was already declining, and when, with the rise of the Puritans, the unity of the country was again threatened by religious differences. The fact is that throughout this period the interpretation of the royal supremacy varied with the character and authority of the persons exercising that authority; and no discussion of this, or of kindred doctrinal problems, is possible unless such discussion is closely related to the course of political and constitutional history.

GERARD CULKIN

*St. Cuthbert's College*
*Ushaw*

*Les débuts du catholicisme social en France (1822-1870).* By Jean-Baptiste Duroselle. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1951. Pp. xii, 787. 1.200 fr.)

What better means is there to render Catholicism unpopular than to enlist it against the efforts of the suffering classes and in the total defense of all that is, the maintenance of the social *status quo*. . . . Is this not to renew the sacrilegeous alliance of the material and the ideal? Is it not to reestablish in the name and under the pretext of property, the fatal union of throne and altar? Does it not risk the creation of a schism between Catholicism and the social ideas of the nineteenth century, comparable to that which the blindness of special interests produced between Christianity and the liberal idea of the eighteenth?

These words of a Christian democrat, Eugene Rendu, were written on September 20, 1848, when the first efforts to awaken the Christian conscience in France to the plight of the industrial workers was on the verge of collapse as a consequence of the June Days. They point up the major problem of nineteenth-century Catholicism: could Catholics be aroused to espouse the cause of justice for those who were without defense in a France dominated by the post-revolutionary bourgeoisie? Tradition favored an affirmative response, for historically the Church had taken the lead in all efforts to relieve human misery. Now that individual charity was no longer adequate, would Catholics become conscious of the dimensions of the social problem, and would they evolve theoretical principles and practical solutions to deal with it? The answer, tragically, was no. But many did make the effort, and some achieved a measure of success. Their attempts, within the period 1822-1870, are exhaustively examined in this volume. Its publication is an event of prime importance for the historian of France. The author, a distinguished political scientist, has reduced a vast amount of unpublished material into a clear, objective account of movements which have only been known obscurely. He has fulfilled his task with the balance of a true scholar and with a touch of originality that will be appreciated by any who have worked in this field.

Social Catholicism was born of a synthesis of two ideas: one, economic —a recognition of the plight of the industrial worker; the other, intellectual—the acceptance of the theory of social progress. When Catholics could define "the progressive amelioration of the moral and material condition of the working man as the very objective of society," social Catholicism made its appearance.

Its roots lie in the 1820's, and so it is nearly as old as the parallel current of socialism. Its progenitors are revealed as more numerous and more productive than is generally believed, but they remained a minor factor in the rapidly evolving intellectual life of their age. They lacked the leadership of a prophet of the stature of Marx or Proudhon; and they

failed to rally the masses of French Catholics. With conspicuous exceptions, the leaders of the Church remained preoccupied with other problems and timid before a movement which they feared might assume revolutionary dimensions. Besides, the social Catholics were divided into Christian democrats and conservatives, with a middle group around Ozanam who, for a few fleeting weeks early in 1848, appeared on the verge of consolidating the varied streams. But the subsequent political crises silenced all but the conservatives, who never really succeeded in penetrating the workers' movements. Hence the working class expanded in an atmosphere alien, and usually hostile, to the Church.

Superficially, the early Christian social effort seems a nearly total failure. But the author shows that although its immediate results were meager, it has provided a heritage of thought and action for the more vigorous movements to come. Thus it played an important role in the history of France and the Church. In the presence of excellence, we are apt to be greedy. This justifies the hope that the author continues his researches in the period beyond 1870.

JOSEPH N. MOODY

*Cathedral College*
*New York*

*The Rise of the Double Diplomatic Corps in Rome.* By Robert A. Graham, S.J. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1952. Pp. xii, 110. 6 guilders.)

When Italian troops occupied Rome on September 20, 1870, the temporal power of the Papacy was for all practical purposes ended. This presented a delicate problem to those governments maintaining formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See and with the recently created Italy, a problem made even more delicate a year later when the Italian capital was transferred from Florence to Rome. Precedence dictated ending diplomatic relations with the Papacy as a temporal power, but various other considerations caused the governments with accredited representatives at Rome to follow a course that was without precedent in diplomatic history.

Through the four years treated in this book there evolved a double diplomatic corps in Rome, one accredited to the King of Italy and the other to the Sovereign Pontiff. In his careful study of the evolution of this practice Father Graham shows the intricate and delicate problems of public law created by this unique situation. His concern is not with the Roman Question as such but rather with the reaction of the various governments to the existence in Rome of two sovereignties. None of the major governments formally recognized the *fait accompli* of Rome's seizure from the Papacy; none of them, on the other hand, formally protested the step.

Father Graham's careful research shows how Italy never thought of denying the spiritual sovereignty of the Holy Father, how, indeed, the Italian government hoped to use this concept to confine the Papacy's relations with other states to the realm of purely religious affairs. The Holy See insisted that temporal sovereignty was necessary as a protection to spiritual sovereignty and, of course, that the Law of Guarantees purporting to settle the Roman difficulty could not be accepted by the Pope. The greater part of this study is devoted to analyzing the reaction to these claims and counter-claims by the governments accredited to the Papacy and to Florence. Bismarck's solution of appointing an ecclesiastic as ambassador (Cardinal von Hohenlohe) was rejected in May, 1872, by Pius IX, and thus the Holy See avoided accepting the Italo-Prussian solution. The papal claim to temporal sovereignty, on the other hand, was not accepted by other powers until a much later time (1929). The double diplomatic corps was a *modus vivendi*, Father Graham concludes, which satisfied nobody but to which all governments accommodated themselves by recognizing the unique position of the Holy See and admitting the need of continued diplomatic relations with the papal court.

THOMAS P. NEILL

*St. Louis University*

*The Life of Baron von Hügel.* By Michael de la Bedoyère. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951. Pp. xviii, 366. $5.00.)

The author of this work, the capable editor of the *Catholic Herald* and biographer of Lafayette, Washington, and St. Catherine of Siena, has given us (without benefit of *imprimatur*, however) an intensely interesting study of one of the central figures in the modernistic crisis in the Church during the last decade of the past century and the first two decades of the present. Mainly through the letters and diary of the Baron von Hügel, Mr. de la Bedoyère has succeeded in recreating the atmosphere in which those who played a leading part in the crisis lived and breathed. The book is a life of the Baron von Hügel; yet the baron cannot be dissociated from his group. He seems to have acted as a self-appointed go-between, a contact man, among the outstanding modernists in England, France, and Italy. The result is all gain for the historian, since a competent biography, such as the present work, enables its readers to watch the unfolding of the phenomenon called modernism from an inner, central standpoint.

The Baron von Hügel is one of the most enigmatic characters of modern times. He was never officially censured by the Church and it is clear from the evidence in Mr. de la Bedoyère's work that he was sincere in

his wish to live and to die in the Church of his baptism. At the same time he ardently championed the cause of the modernists, publicly and privately. He was bound in ties of close friendship and deep admiration for Loisy and Tyrrell, even though toward the end of his life he became somewhat disillusioned about modernism and modernists. His sympathies were invariably with so-called liberal critics and thinkers of any or no denominational ties. His ardent, impetuous nature caused him to fret at the restraints imposed by the Church authorities upon unlimited criticism, especially in scriptural studies.

Mr. de la Bedoyère throws as much light as can be thrown upon this baffling character. A fundamental fact emerges early in the work. The baron never had the benefit of any regular schooling and never enjoyed any university training. "He was self-educated, with the help of tutors, into the scholar's world" (p. 15). Again it is stated, "He never sat for an examination in his life, nor entered any school or academy" (p. 31). Extremely individualistic in his thinking, he describes himself as having "a strong tendency to fall out of the ranks; to break away from the corporate, the belonging, as a part, to any one body as a whole" (p. 20). Yet, with this background, without the discipline of formal, scientific training ("a theologically untrained layman"—p. 103), the baron did not hesitate to plunge into the difficult field of historical criticism of the Bible. He quickly became the victim of the latest book or pronouncement of every so-called higher critic in France, England, Italy, or Germany. His patronage was indiscriminating, where science and criticism were concerned.

Unfortunately, von Hügel imbibed a great deal of the intellectual and spiritual snobbery that characterized so many of the modernists. They regarded themselves as a persecuted group, for whom the Church authorities were invariably ignorant, unlettered obscurantists, and Pius X just a peasant. We wonder at times if the author, in spite of his efforts at objectivity and impartiality, does not at least to some extent share these views.

Besides biblical criticism, mysticism was a main interest in the baron's life. Much of his written work and lectures was in this field. His style, however, is difficult and laborious, and his thought too often involved and obscure. What saved him from the immanentism of the modernists was his grasp of the transcendence of God. He emphasizes repeatedly that God and the Catholic faith were the "luminous center" in his life. So far as a philosophical basis to his thinking is concerned, von Hügel leaned toward an idealistic and Kantian position. He speaks of "the phenomenal curtain" behind which, in the background, is the "noumenal reality" (p. 116).

The book is provided with a good index. Two minor slips have been noted: 1913 should read 1903 (p. 147, n. 2); and "charged" should be "changed" (p. 205, n. 1). No library on modernism can afford to be without this biography.

WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR

*St. Joseph's Seminary*
*Yonkers*

## AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

*Catholicism and American Freedom.* By James M. O'Neill. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1952. Pp. xii, 287. $3.50.)

This book has already been extensively reviewed and, it may be hoped, widely read. It is a reply to Paul Blanshard's *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. Everyone who is concerned about truth, justice, and tolerance is indebted to Mr. O'Neill for placing Mr. Blanshard's book in its proper perspective. One of the sad things about the reaction to Mr. Blanshard's book was the general acceptance by non-Catholics of its pretensions to be a work of unimpeachable scholarship, of careful documentation, of scrupulously fair criticism when, in fact, its almost every page gave evidence that it was quite the opposite. Some willfully, because of their own prejudices, some witlessly, because too easily impressed by a mere quantitative marshalling of footnotes, were blind to this evidence. If they could be excused before, they cannot, since the publication of Mr. O'Neill's work, be excused any longer.

The scrutiny to which Mr. O'Neill subjects Mr. Blanshard's techniques and his misuse of documentation effectively exposes the kind of massive deception which *American Freedom and Catholic Power* practiced upon its more gullible readers. In my opinion this is the most important achievement of Mr. O'Neill's book.

As one who has written a pamphlet reply to *American Freedom and Catholic Power* and who has met Mr. Blanshard in public debate, I know how impossible it is within the limitations of a single volume to answer all of his charges or any of them adequately. Mr. O'Neill has met this difficulty inherent in the nature of the subjects raised and in the techniques of argument employed by his opponent, as well as anyone could expect. He has not attempted to reply to everything Mr. Blanshard has written. He has, in chapters four to eleven of his volume, discussed eight of the more important issues. One cannot expect to find here a full treatment of the subjects discussed. For a more comprehensive understanding of such subjects, e.g., as Catholic opinion about Church and State, it will still be necessary to read Maritain's *Man and the State*, Simon's *Phi-*

*losophy of Democratic Government,* Rommen's *The State in Catholic Thought,* and John Courtney Murray's several studies. The average person who has been influenced by Blanshard's writings is not likely, however, to find his way to such works as these. For such Mr. O'Neill furnishes sufficient enlightenment and argumentation to purge their minds of the false fears inspired by Mr. Blanshard.

Many Protestant ministers, men of good will and of good sense, were not beguiled by Mr. Blanshard's book. Letters which many of them wrote to me make this clear. Many of them agreed with the sentiments expressed by one, the pastor of a prominent Presbyterian church, who wrote, thanking me for my pamphlet reply to Blanshard: "I'm only sorry that you felt it necessary to use so much valuable space . . . to emphasize his intellectual narrowness and emotional bigotry. Very few of any faith or any Faith, who read objectively, could fail to see that in him."

For those others who failed to see that in him Mr. O'Neill's book should help clear their vision.

GEORGE H. DUNNE

*St. Francis Xavier Church*
*Phoenix*

*Democracy and the Churches.* By James Hastings Nichols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1951. Pp. 298. $4.50.)

About 1945 a group of American "Puritan-Protestant" church leaders (who were later organized as the Committee on Religious Tolerance affiliated with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America) commissioned Dr. James Hastings Nichols, of the University of Chicago, to produce "an objective statement" on "the attitude of the various communions toward democracy." "It was our aim," says Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin in his foreword to the present book, "to discover if possible which of the communions had effectively fostered liberty and brotherhood, and which had been antagonistic."

After several years of diligent study Dr. Nichols produced the present book which sets forth the thesis that Anglo-American democracy owes its principles primarily to "Puritan-Protestant" antecedents, rather than to those of continental Lutheranism, pure Anglicanism, pure Calvinism, or to Greek Orthodoxy or Roman Catholicism. By this "Puritan-Protestant" tradition he means "the common ethos of that family of Anglo-American denominations whose best-known representatives are the Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Unitarians, Quakers, Disciples, Salvation Army, and the evangelical party within the Anglican communion." There are, he believes, three theological elements which

constitute their chief contribution to Anglo-American liberal democracy. They are: liberty of discussion as productive of new truth through divine guidance; the "gathered" church, whose voluntary members are pledged by a sort of "social contract" to responsible common action; and the principle of Church-State separation in which the Christian man will still exercise his civic duties according to the Calvinist tradition, but be guided simply "by the moral law as evident to all men of good will, rather than appealing to special revelation or ecclesiastical authority." The author discerns this trend as unfolding through the years in the political and social democracy of the "Anglo-Saxon" nations. Dr. Nichols' discussion, when it probes this indubitable contribution of Anglo-Saxon non-conformism to our democratic political forms, is very enlightening. The reader will probably feel, however, that he should also have stressed a little more the general legal traditions of Anglo-Saxon law as an important fundamental cause of this democratic development.

In contrast to the more active contribution of Puritan Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, the author finds, has made a much less substantial contribution to the evolution of political democracy. If, in demonstrating this contrast, Professor Nichols had limited himself to proving that the Catholic Church has not favored democracy over other forms of government in her doctrinal pronouncements; or if he had limited himself to assaying the sometimes undemocratic personal preferences on the administrative measures of recent Pontiffs, he would have been on safe ground and would have had a relatively easy task. Instead, he sets out to prove that the Catholic Church, practically speaking, is positively and irrevocably anti-democratic; that its hierarchy is necessarily committed to a policy "to undermine the American democratic principle of Church and State"; that this Catholic attitude furnishes "adequate *political* grounds for questioning the suitability of candidates for offices related to American foreign policy"; and that Puritan Protestantism should eschew not only Marxism, but also any alliance with Catholicism against Marxism, since both of them are, after all, "politically authoritarian and dogmatically illiberal." Dr. Nichols' demonstration of this part of his thesis is more "emphatic" than convincing, however, for even his most cautious phraseology cannot make up for faulty interpretation, the omission of relevant data, and the making of unsubstantiated statements.

As regards interpretation, the author is, of course, at an initial disadvantage in his strongly Protestant conviction that authority and totalitarianism are practically equivalent. He is also apparently unable to appreciate the fact that the hierarchy's primary interest is spiritual, and that the Catholic Church, even from a motive of policy, could not, as a universal church, afford to identify itself absolutely with governments or forms of government. In addition to this initial misconception the author also

seems to consider "infallible doctrine," "authentic doctrine," and even (in the case of Father Cappello) "probable opinion," as to all intents and purposes synonymous. This may, again, be the result of misunderstanding. It may also be by device, for he has set out to place American Catholics in the position of choosing between American democracy or "heresy." A third mistake, which weakens his comparison, perhaps, more than any other, is his failure to point out that continental absolutism owes far more to the tradition of Roman civil law than to the example of a Church which Christ chose to found on a monarchical basis.

These misconceptions, and his constant failure to emphasize adequately the general context of his documentary quotes, cannot but undermine the probative value of much of Professor Nichols' evidence. Thus his analysis of the *Syllabus* is often quite incorrect (e.g., propositions 23, 74, 77, 80); his analyses of *Rerum novarum*, and *Graves de communi* of Leo XIII, and of the *Pieni l'animo* of Pius X, to mention three encyclicals, are unsatisfactory and at times clearly erroneous. In controversial matters he tends to deny that there is another side, by making no mention of important contrary considerations. Thus he makes out Pius X as "the agent of L'Action Française," without indicating the fact that Pius condemned Maurras' books and periodical. He criticizes Pius XI's attitude towards the Abyssinian War (as he is entitled to); but he should have made some reference to the same Pope's condemnation of the preparations for that war. He is welcome to his opinion on the essence of the Spanish Civil War; but he surely must realize that there is at least a question that the popular front government was "legitimate," and that Russian interest in the conflict began only when she started sending military aid openly.

Such methodological flaws as these not only disqualify the second phase of Dr. Nichols' thesis as an "objective statement"; they also relegate his book to the category of a tract upon a familiar but regrettable theme.

ROBERT F. MCNAMARA

*St. Bernard's Seminary*

*Revêtues de force.* By Sister Marguerite-Felicie, F.S.E. (Worcester: Caron Press. 1952. Pp. xvii, 213. $3.25.)

The story Sister Marguerite-Felicie tells is of the first fifty years in the United States of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost, a Breton order founded in 1706. It is a story containing elements of interest rather special. Excluded from their work of teaching by the association laws of an anti-clerical government, a number of Brittany's "White Sisters" came to this

country, first at the invitation of the Bishop of Hartford and later of other bishops, and began a fruitful if difficult mission wherever they established themselves. Their activity has been confined largely to New England, and here their destinies have become interwoven with those of the French-Canadian population.

The author touches here and there on the cultural complexities involved in this situation, of French and French-Canadian working hand-in-hand at religious and educational tasks under the guidance of New England bishops. Her primary concern, however, as we might expect in an anniversary volume, is not with "problems" but with chronicle, with records of the power of divine grace shown forth consistently in the accomplishments of the Daughters, "clothed in strength," since the day, December 2, 1902, when the first six of them landed in New York, up to the present, when they number over 450 in seven American dioceses. This theme Sister Marguerite-Felicie develops skillfully and objectively, without any of the embarrassing coyness or misty subterfuge with which works of this genre are sometimes afflicted. We could wish, nevertheless, that she had found room for a more extended presentation of conditions in the American Church, and more particularly in the Church of New England, at the time when the first "White Sisters" arrived, and significant developments since. This would prove a valuable frame of reference, especially for the non-American reader. Immigration, urbanization, the fortunes of the New England textile industry—all these are matters which, grim and "unspiritual" as they may sound, are not irrelevant to the past history of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost in this country, nor without bearing on their future.

*Revêtues de force* has been written in French, not only for the many French-speaking friends and *anciens élèves* of the Daughters here in the United States but even more particularly for the other members of the congregation in France and elsewhere. The logic of the author's choice of language is clear; but we hope that an English translation of the work will appear in due time. The story of these sisters in the United States is not only a part of the history of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost, a Breton order; it is also a chapter—a remarkably interesting and attractive chapter, we think—in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States, and it must take its due place in that history.

RALPH KELLEY

*Annhurst College*

GENERAL HISTORY

*Enciclopedia Cattolica.* Published under the direction of Pio Paschini, Rector of the Pontificio Ateneo Lateranense, and of Celestino Testore, S.J., and A. Pietro Frutaz, with the assistance of a large number of collaborators. (Città del Vaticano: Ente per l'Enciclopedia Cattolica e per il Libro Cattolica, 1949 ff. Volumes I-VIII, /A-NZ/, Cols. xxxi, 2015; xxiv, 2015; xxvi, 2015; xxvii, 2015; xxvii, 2015; xxvii, 2015; xxvii, 2047.)

This new Catholic encyclopaedia published under Vatican auspices and dedicated to Pope Pius XII not only meets a long felt need in Italy, but is also to be warmly welcomed as a very valuable reference work for Catholics and non-Catholics throughout the world. Our own *Catholic Encyclopedia,* an outstanding contribution for its time, is now quite antiquated—apart from the supplements, and even the excellent *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* is in part out-of-date. The great French ecclesiastical encyclopaedias are likewise out-of-date in their earlier volumes. Furthermore, they are more specialized in character. The scope of the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* is described succinctly in the "Presentazione" written by Cardinal Pizzardo, who served as honorary president of the editorial board. It is intended to be an up-to-date, authoritative Catholic reference work covering formally and adequately every aspect of knowledge, science, and civilization of concern to Catholicism in any way. It is a pleasure to report that, as compared with the two general Catholic encyclopaedias mentioned above, the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* is much broader and comprehensive in its range of articles and interests. In many respects, it is a general encyclopaedia written from a Catholic point of view and infused with a Catholic spirit. The total number of articles will be about 25,000. While hundreds of entries, as in the *Larousse* and *Grosse Herder,* do not comprise more than a few lines, all important subjects are generally given adequate space, the articles running at times to many columns.

The *Enciclopedia Cattolica* is magnificently produced. The work is published in quarto. Each volume contains about 2,000 columns, i.e., about 1,000 pages, is printed on excellent paper, and is sumptiously bound in red cloth with gold lettering and with bands of gold, black, and green on the spine. The type fonts chosen are exceptionally clear and easy on the eye. The artistic harmony and attractiveness of the printed page is only matched in the encyclopaedia field by that of the *Enciclopedia Italiana,* and the same is true of the profusion of magnificent plates—many in colors, cuts inserted in the text, and maps. Volume I, e.g., contains 136 full-page plates, Volume VIII—the last published to date—128.

To review the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* in detail—even if space were available—would require a whole corps of specialists. It must suffice, there-

fore, to call attention to a few of the more important articles, to make some critical comments on a few sample articles falling within the special competence of the reviewer, and in particular to examine a number of the articles dealing with the Church in the United States. It should be remembered, of course, that the present work has been planned and written with Italian needs and interests primarily in mind, and that, with few exceptions, the articles have been contributed by Italian scholars, or by foreign scholars living in Rome during the past decade.

Obviously, there are very many long and short articles in the field of theology and the related disciplines. A few may be cited as representative: "Agostinismo" (I, cols. 503-511), "Agostino, Aurelio" (I, 519-567, an excellent article by C. Boyer), "Ambrogio" (I, 984-1000, by O. Faller), "Apologetica, letteratura" (I, 1659-1669), "Atanasio" (II, 254-262, by M. Jugie), "Basilio" (II, 971-979, by M. Pellegrino), "Bibbia" (II, 1545-1587, chiefly by G. Ricciotti), "Calvino" (III, 402-417), "Canonizzazione" (III, 569-607), "Catechési" (III, 1094-1115), "Clemente Alessandrino" (III, 1842-1857), "Eusebio di Cesarea" (V, 841-854), "Girolomo" (VI, 652-661, by F. Cavallera), "Gregorio Nisseno" (VI, 1096-1111, by J. Daniélou), "Gregorio I, Papa" (VI, 1112-1126), "Martirio e Martire" (VIII, 233-244), "Messa" (VIII, 757-830), "Monogenismo" (VII, 1305-1307). The articles on the fathers of the Church and mediaeval theologians and philosophers are generally very good and abreast of the latest research.

The *Enciclopedia Cattolica* gives a prominent place to ancient, mediaeval, and modern philosophy. The articles dealing with modern rationalistic systems and their representatives would seem to be particularly well done. Among them may be mentioned here: "Agnosticismo" (I, 479-488), "Anima" (I, 1290-1340), "Conoscenza" (IV, 363-391), "Descartes" (IV, 1465-1472), "Filosofica dello spirito" (V, 1364-1367, on Croce), "Esistenzialismo" (V, 586-591), "Estetica" (V, 632-642), "Hegel" (VI, 1386-1392), "Idealismo" (VI, 1562-1569), "Kant" (VII, 640-652), "Leibnitz" (VII, 1085-1092), "Materialismo Dialettico" (VIII, 366-377), "Materialismo Storico" (VIII, 377-388), "Monismo" (VIII, 1291-1295), "Naturalismo" (VIII, 1683-1687), "Neocriticismo" (1739-1741), "Neopositivismo" (VIII, 1755-1757), "Nietzsche" (VIII, 1872-1876).

There are also a number of good articles covering the natural sciences, e.g., "Continuo" (IV, 457-460), "Elettricità," and related articles (V, 211-222), "Matematica" (VIII, 331-350), "Materia, Costituzione della" (VIII, 350-362), "Microbiologia" (VIII, 966-979), "Nucleo Atomico" (VIII, 1987-1990).

In anthropology, political science, sociology, etc., it will be enough to mention the articles "Antisemetismo" (I, 1494-1505, with valuable bibliography), "Antropologia" (I, 1562-1579), "Comunismo" (IV, 143-158),

"Democrazia Cristiana" (IV, 1406-1413), "Dottrina Sociale Cristiana" (IV, 1909-1914), "Genere Umano, Età del" (V, 2000-2002).

There are a large number of articles devoted in whole or in part to geography and ethnology. Among the more important may be cited: "Africa" (I, 378-417), "Asia Minore" (II, 126-135), "Egitto" (V, 145-180), "Etnologia" (V, 710-733), "Francia" (V, 1623-1688), "Germania" (VI, 121-177), "Italia" (VII, 374-503). The article, "America," however, is hardly adequate, especially in respect to North America. More will be said on this and related matters *infra*.

Language, literature, and art are well represented. Among the more important articles are: "Cursus" (IV, 1083-1092, by F. Di Capua), "Dante" (IV, 1167-1212), "Epigrafia Cristiana" (V, 429-440, by A. Ferrua), "Filologia" (V, 1337-1342), "Gotica, Arte" (VI, 940-954), "Indoeuropei" (1879-1885, by W. Havers), "Innografia" (VII, 28-41), "Ispano-Americana, Letteratura" (VII, 305-316), "Leonardo da Vinci" (VII, 1120-1133), "Linguaggio" (VII, 1369-1376), "Linguistica" (VII, 1382-1388), "Latino Cristiano" (VII, 944-947, by C. Mohrmann), "Maiolica" (VII, 1861-1867), "Manzoni" (VII, 1998-2008), "Michelangelo" (VIII, 933-946), "Minnesang" (VIII, 1043-1045), "Moderna, Arte Sacra" (VIII, 1170-1188). The article on "Goethe" (VI, 894-986), is, however, hardly adequate. Because of the German poet's great influence, his *Weltanschauung*—in part hostile to the whole spirit of Catholicism—should have been defined more precisely. The biography by Baumgartner-Stockmann, although sometimes too severe in its evaluations, is an important work and should not have been omitted from the bibliography.

General history, biography, and related fields bulk large, naturally, in the work under review. All in all, the historical and biographical articles—apart from those dealing with the United States—are well done. To the outstanding articles mentioned *supra* may be added, e.g., "Manning" (VII, 1974-1977), "Newman" (VIII, 1800-1805), "Islam" (VII, 258-293), "Massoneria" (VIII, 312-325), "Medioevo" (VIII, 599-618).

An encyclopaedia of its very nature is bound to reveal certain weaknesses, and the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* has not been able to escape in this regard. The exceptionally large number of lemmata, perhaps, facilitate ready reference, but many of the short articles have little solid meat, and certain subjects or fields suffer seriously from fragmentation. This is true, e.g., in palaeography and art. The bibliographies following the articles are quite uneven. In many cases the bibliographical data are too scanty, at least in essentials, or are not sufficiently up-to-date. Bibliographical weaknesses are especially noticeable in the first three or four volumes. They may be explained, perhaps, in part by the fact that these volumes were prepared for publication before Italian scholars had full access to foreign

books--English and American books in particular—in the first post-war years.

But the most glaring and consistent weakness of the new encyclopaedia is revealed in the articles dealing with America, and especially with the United States. Curiously enough, the few articles on American statesmen and writers—Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, William James, etc., are relatively more satisfactory than those on the Catholic Church itself in our country. All the Carrolls get little more than a single column (III, 937-938), Cardinal Gibbons (VII, 383-384), about two-thirds of a column, Archbishop Ireland (VII, 191-192), Archbishop Michael Corrigan, the Kenricks, and McCloskey less than half a column each. McQuaid of Rochester and Hughes of New York are not included at all. The treatment of the great archdioceses of our country is even more inadequate, when one realizes that not only in their large numbers of practicing Catholics, but in their flourishing clergy, educational systems, welfare institutions, etc., they are among the leading archdioceses in the world. Baltimore (II, 758-760) gets a little more than a column; Boston not quite a column, the standard history of the archdiocese not being mentioned; Chicago is given only half a column, but the Parliament of Religions held in Chicago in 1893 a column; Detroit receives a column, but Philadelphia (V, 1287-1288), and Los Angeles only half a column each. New York (VII, 2033-2036) is given about two columns of text, with an additional two-thirds of a column on Fordham University. No other educational institutions in the New York area are mentioned by name. Most of the articles on the Catholic Church in the United States just listed were written by Conrad Morin, O.F.M., of Montreal. That on New York was contributed by Father J. Carrière of Ottawa. Why competent scholars in our own country were not asked to contribute these articles is not clear. The article "Americanismo" (I, 1054-1056) is particularly bad because of its misinformation on a touchy subject. The writer was apparently ignorant of the important studies of Holden, McAvoy, and others, devoted to the subject in the last twenty-five years. Incidentally, the article in the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* cited in the bibliography is likewise unsatisfactory. The article "Know-Nothing" (VII, 723) is quite superficial and reveals no knowledge of bibliography later than the old article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. In the article "Dottrina Sociale Cristiana" (cited *supra*), Cardinal Gibbons is mentioned in the main text, and references are given in the bibliography to Nuesse, Maynard, Abell, Pattee, and Browne, but no reference whatever is made to John A. Ryan and his great contributions. In the article "Biblioteca" (II, especially 1616-1617) nothing is said of the J. P. Morgan Library, the Huntington Library, the Princeton Theological Library, the Newberry Library in Chicago, etc., all of which contain so much precious material of direct concern to Catholic culture and scholar-

ship. Furthermore, mention should have been made of the rich collections of material for Catholic Church history available at the University of Notre Dame and at the Catholic University of America. It is certainly to be hoped that some of the shortcomings indicated will be remedied in later volumes, particularly in the article "Stati Uniti," which is promised in the article "America."

But in spite of the weaknesses indicated, the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* is an excellent work. Its editors are to be congratulated for their successful planning and organization of such a vast project, and for bringing it so rapidly to realization. At the present rate of publication, the encyclopaedia will be available in its entirety early in 1953.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

*The Catholic University of America*

*The Uses of the Past: Profiles of Former Societies.* By Herbert J. Muller. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 394. $5.50.)

History shares with philosophy the unhappy distinction of being a field in which angels do *not* fear to tread. The author of this book is neither a professional historian nor a professional philosopher, but a professor of English at Purdue University. Presumably, he would hesitate to write a book on atomic fission or the differential calculus. Yet history and philosophy are as much and as truly disciplines as are physics and mathematics. This work discusses almost everything: the nature of history, pre-history, Israel, Greece, Rome, Christianity, western Europe, Byzantium, and imperial and Marxist Russia. This is the kind of exercise that strains the mature and disciplined mind of an Arnold Toynbee; a less competent man undertakes it only at his peril.

The author fails to distinguish between history as a discipline and philosophy as a discipline, and the purposes of each. History takes for granted the historical process, and tries to explain events within it (e.g., the French Revolution) in terms of antecedent, efficient causes of an historical nature. This is a relatively straightforward task, which can be accomplished by the application of the historical method, and leads to reasonably adequate (though not ultimately satisfying) results. Philosophy, on the other hand, tries to explain, among other things, the historical process as such in terms of a cause or causes which themselves are non-historical. Otherwise, of course, they would lie within the historical process and subject to historical scrutiny. This philosophical approach, the search for final causes, is more difficult, as it is more fundamental, than the historical, for it examines not only history but also the nature and kinds of being, in order that history may be related to all reality. Its

application requires training in philosophical method. The author of this book is trained neither in the historical nor in the philosophical method.

Charity requires a word of praise for the good will and enthusiasm of the author, as well as for a certain untamed imaginative quality in his prose. However, he needs to cultivate two basic virtues: the ability to distinguish, which is the beginning of clear thinking; and the art of economy in composition, which is the beginning of clear writing.

WILLIAM F. MCDONALD

*Ohio State University*

*Landmarks in the History of Education. English Education as Part of the European Tradition.* By T. L. Jarman. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. viii, 323. $4.75.)

In the 307 pages of his text Mr. Jarman has been remarkably successful in covering with lucidity and a sense of proportion a vast period of educational history stretching from Hesiod to the English Education Act of 1944—and beyond. His theme is the development of education in England as a part of the European tradition that is rooted in the culture of ancient Greece and Rome. Too many books on educational history tend to lose touch with the historical realities of the subject by over-much attention to academic theorists and reformers with ideal abstract systems from Plato onwards. Mr. Jarman does not fall into this trap, and while his treatment of the theorists is appreciative and just and his appraisal of their practical influence on the whole sensible, he has his eyes firmly fixed upon the actual historical conditions, whether he is dealing with the Roman or the Tudor school boy, or, in the nineteenth century, with the public-school boy or the student of a mechanics institute, or in making his revealing contrast between the educational experiences of H.A.L. Fisher and H. G. Wells.

The same feeling for history and reality lies behind the key sentence in the final paragraph of the book: "The long story of European education reveals that each and every period and territory has had very much the kind of education which its own way of life made necessary and possible." It lies, too, behind the realization that the modern ideal of education for all, which has followed upon industrialism, and which, in different ways, is attempted alike in the United States, in England, and in the U.S.S.R., implies new complications and distinctions in the very concept of education itself. Less fully brought out, perhaps, except in the obvious cases of Nazi Germany and Marxist Russia, are the far-reaching philosophical implications of state paternalism and state control of education, even when that education is itself literally conceived; and Catholic readers of Mr. Jarman's otherwise admirably balanced and sensible book—which is not

by any means uncritically adulatory of every modern educational development in England—will miss an adequate discussion of the modern religious issue and may be allowed to regret that he was not able to spare space in his, admittedly highly condensed, text for even a passing reference to the considerable Catholic educational achievements in modern England. Nevertheless, all readers will gain from Mr. Jarman's survey an excellent impression of existing English educational institutions and ideas, of the importance of the English public schools and the English grammar schools, and, to a less extent, of the English universities. The complicated story of educational aspirations and new educational institutions in nineteenth-century England together with the main comparisons and contrasts with the continent is well summarized, and the main points of twentieth-century developments clearly brought out. The author's skill in presenting institutional history against the background of social, political, and intellectual developments gives life and interest to his work.

H. Outram Evennett

*Trinity College*
*Cambridge*

*Readings in Western Civilization.* Selected and edited by George H. Knoles and Rexford K. Snyder. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1951. Pp. xi, 896. $5.00.)

This type of volume has now become a must as history courses tend more and more toward the sweeping survey. How this work, which the authors say is not a substitute for a textbook, will be fully utilized is not explained. To cover a text of 1,000 pages and a book of readings of nearly 900, with the time element still the bane of an instructor's life, calls for a bit of reflection. As in all works of this type the question as to what should be included always makes for disagreement. This book is no exception. The authors spend a great deal of time in the ancient Greek and Roman civilization at the expense of the Renaissance. The Protestant Revolt suffers from a one-sided approach, and from a lack of material on the subject. The old error of calling the Protestant Revolt a reformation still persists. On the era of enlightened despotism, the question of the divine right of kings and intellectual developments the volume moves too easily and with few if any examples.

In the later periods there is a tendency to overemphasize the side of labor at the expense of industry. The tremendous growth that the Industrial Revolution gave the world is missed completely. The work of American labor is passed over without mention. Western civilization is given a strange approach in this section of the text. In the contemporary civiliza-

tion section it is amazing to note that while Hitler, Mussolini, and Churchill are mentioned, Franklin D. Roosevelt is not quoted. The great events of our time are summed up in T. S. Eliot, Reinhold Niebuhr, and the United States Strategic Bombing Survey. This is the weakest section of many weak areas of this volume.

The attempt to cover such a huge section of world history as is shown here will always help to emphasize weakness. The authors have, in the materials used, put together a workable volume.

JAMES J. FLYNN

*Fordham University*

*Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ.* Two Volumes. By David Magie. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xxi, 1661. $20.00 set.)

These two volumes constitute one of the major contributions to Roman history made during the past three decades. While acknowledging his indebtedness in particular to W. Ruge, L. Robert, T. R. S. Broughton, A. H. M. Jones, Rostovtzeff, and E. V. Hansen—and he might have added V. Chapot, the author has made a fresh study of all the available literary, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence and has produced a new and independent work which, at least within the scope proposed, is distinguished for its comprehensiveness, thoroughness, and accuracy. Only those who have carried on scholarly research in the history of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor and Syria will understand the tremendous difficulties involved in controlling the widely scattered source materials—especially the inscriptions—and the modern studies in many languages, and will appreciate fully Magie's achievement in this regard.

The general plan of presentation is the following. Volume I contains the main exposition. The history of the six Roman provinces of Asia Minor—Asia, Bithynia-Pontus, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia, and Lycia-Pamphylia—is given in the order of their acquisition and organization by Rome. The pre-Roman backgrounds are adequately covered in each case. Chapters I-IV, e.g., contain a detailed account of the Kingdom of Pergamum before the bequest of Attalus III. Throughout, special emphasis is placed on geography and the geographical factors affecting the political and economic history of Asia Minor. Volume II is devoted to bibliographical data and to copious notes in which all controversial questions and problems are discussed with the necessary detail. There are two valuable appendices: I, Roman Provincial Governors and their Subordinates, and II, Provincial Dignitaries. Finally, the work is furnished with excellent indices (pp. 1616-1661) and a good map. The

pagination of the two volumes is consecutive and cross-references from text to notes are given with admirable fullness and clarity.

Important as the present work is, it must be emphasized that it is almost exclusively political and economic in scope. The author has deliberately omitted cultural and religious history from his exposition—apart from the imperial cult with its essential political implications. Furthermore, it must be stated frankly that he shows a much better sense of perspective at the beginning of his story than at its end, or rather at the end which he has chosen. His last two chapters, entitled "From Gold to Iron," and "Decay and Chaos," betray a somewhat classicist and old fashioned attitude towards the late empire. The last paragraph of the main text, e.g., will give the non-specialist reader a false idea of the really great significance of Asia Minor in the period from Diocletian to Heraclius, a span of years almost as long as that from Attalus III to Diocletian's accession. The author may feel justified in omitting cultural and religious history on the score that his book had already grown too large, but the fact remains that in literature, art, and religion Asia Minor was one of the most significant regions of the empire. To say nothing of the pagan Greco-Oriental cults, it should be remembered that it was precisely in Asia Minor that Christianity won its most numerous adherents in the period before Diocletian. While one perhaps should not quarrel with the author for not telling the whole story, it is only fair, in terms of a broader historical perspective, to point out that one of the most important, if not the most important, parts of that story has been touched upon so incidentally as not to be told at all. But in spite of its exclusion of cultural and religious history, the present work is a most valuable one. It will furnish indispensable background for a proper understanding of the environment of Christianity in Asia Minor under the early empire.

The work is beautifully and accurately printed and the price these days can hardly be regarded as too high.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

*The Catholic University of America*

*Studies in Roman Economics and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson.* Edited by P. R. Coleman-Norton. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. xiii, 373. $5.00.)

This book contains twenty-three essays in honor of Allan Chester Johnson and the high quality of most of them is a fitting tribute to the scholar whose attainments they celebrate. The several articles here noticed are this reviewer's choice, not arbitrarily made, to be sure, but at the same time not meant to cast reflection upon others equally worthy of notice and passed over because of limitations of space.

Lily Ross Taylor ("Caesar's Agrarian Legislation and His Municipal Policy") writes a valuable excursus to Rudolph's interpretation in *Staat und Stadt in römischen Italien* (pp. 186 ff.) of the *Lex Mamilia Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia,* in which she persuasively argues that this law was a tribunicial enactment of 55 B.C., carried by Caesar's adherents for opportunistic political purposes, and not, as Rudolph maintains, a deliberate and calculated step in Caesar's program for the complete urbanization of Italy. Michael Grant ("A Step toward World-Coinage: 19 B.C.") presents a tightly-written, carefully-reasoned argument that in 19 B.C., within a period of a few months, Augustus established three mints at Pergamum, Rome, and in Gaul, very probably at Nemausus, for the issuance of gold, silver, and (at Rome) token coins in two new materials, *orichalcum* and pure copper. Augustus' purpose was to celebrate the Parthian settlement, and, by an unprecedented output, to provide the (Roman) world with an adequate coinage.

Andreas Alföldi ("The Initials of Christ on the Helmet of Constantine") provides an essay which he had promised in his *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (p. 129, n. 14) to support Delbrück's contention that the medallion of Constantine—represented by two specimens only, one in Vienna, and the other in Leningrad, and showing the monogram of Christ, was struck at Ticinum in 315, and not, as von Schönebeck has argued, in the early twenties. Martin P. Charlesworth ("Roman Trade with India: A Resurvey") discusses the sensational find made recently at Arikamedu, just south of Pondicherry, where, amid the remains of a warehouse and quays, some 150 sherds of Arretine ware, together with other objects of Roman provenance, were uncovered [cf. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, "Arikamedu: An Indo-Roman Trading Station on the East Coast of India" in *Ancient India,* No. 2 (July 1946), pp. 17 ff.].

T. R. S. Broughton ("New Evidence on Temple-Estates in Asia Minor") examines the new inscription, found and noted by G. Iacopi in the *Bolletino del Museo dell'Impero Romano,* IX [1938], 44-49, commemorating the restoration by Hadrian of the boundaries of the temple land of Zeus of Aezani as under Prusias. As Broughton makes clear—and it is interesting that David Magie in his recent work *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* arrives independently at the same conclusion—this new evidence compels us finally to abandon Sir William Ramsay's theory that the temples in Asia Minor originally possessed vast landed property, which property was subsequently seized, at least in part, by the Hellenistic monarchs for their own use. It now appears clear that the temple estates were neither vast nor appropriated by the kings.

WILLIAM F. MCDONALD

*Ohio State University*

*The Philosophy of the Enlightenment.* By Ernest Cassirer. Translated by Fritz C. A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. xiii, 366. $6.00.)

First published in Germany in 1932, Professor Cassirer's study is as much the history of a culture as the history of a philosophy. An intensive examination of the Enlightenment by means of its basic principles and problems, the work concentrates on six main themes: natural science, psychology and epistemology, religion, history, society and aesthetics. The approach is thus less factually than philosophically historical.

It is impossible to reduce the philosophy of the Enlightenment to a system or find any doctrinal consensus in the leading thinkers of the period. Nevertheless, Cassirer endeavors to elucidate the inner formative forces of the *Aufklärung*, to give as it were a "phenomenology of the philosophic spirit," to show "how this spirit, struggling with purely objective problems, achieves clarity and depth in its understanding of its own nature and destiny, and of its own fundamental character and mission." Philosophy, for the Enlightenment, is not a special field of knowledge, but rather the all-comprehensive medium in which the principles of natural science, law, history, etc., are formulated, developed, and founded. The fundamental force that is the formative principle of reality is reason: not the analytical deductive reason of the Cartesian cycle, but reason constructing its ideal according to the pattern and model of natural science. That is, Newtonian physics furnishes the true method of metaphysics: the search for the particular and the phenomenon, but at the same time the quest for unity, unification being the basic role of reason.

From the viewpoint of the history of a culture, the chapter on religion is of special interest. Cassirer would not see the Enlightenment as an age basically irreligious and inimical to religion, for it proclaimed a new form of faith and embodied a new form of religion. Yet it withdrew the various fields of knowledge from the domination and tutelage of metaphysics and theology; and rejecting the doctrine of original sin (which it did not understand), proclaimed a religion of freedom and reason. Dogma, not doubt, is considered the most dreaded foe of knowledge; dogma, that is, superstition. Here one finds the roots of indifferentism, since the philosophers of the period would seek and see a basic identity of religion despite different rites and different dogmatic teachings; hence their interest in and emphasis on what was called natural religion.

Lastly, the chapter on "The Conquest of the Historical World" presents the attempt of the Enlightenment to grasp the meaning of history and the laws that govern man's interpretation of it. The concept of history is "less a finished form with clear outlines than a force exerting its influence in all directions." Bayle and Voltaire occupy the main place,

with Hume and Leibniz, though the chapter is not exhaustive in delineating the first attempts at a critical non-theological philosophy of history.

The book is of interest to the historian as well as the philosopher. In fact, it furnishes a needed background for students of English and American literature.

IGNATIUS BRADY

*St. Bonaventure University*

## MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

*A History of Medieval Latin Literature.* By Maurice Hélin. Translated by Jean Chapman Snow. (New York: William Salloch. 1949. Pp. 130. $3.00.)

The French original of this translation, published in the Collection Lebègue, is by the librarian of the University of Liège. In the compass of eighty-five pages Maurice Hélin has achieved a veritable masterpiece of condensation. In some ways it is comparable to Mackail's famous little volume on classical Latin literature, though, for all its presence in a popular series, it is much more learned. To achieve it the author has conceived of literature in a very narrow sense, confining himself largely to imaginative writings. Moreover, he devotes only five pages to the period after the twelfth century. He begins toward the end of the fifth century, and in the earlier parts of his volume casts a rather wide net because writers are few. Later, even favorites, such as Guibert de Nogent and Suger, are not treated. Hélin avoids the monotony of a catalogue by picturing some authors in vivid detail while he accords but a few lines to others. He succeeds very well in tracing the development of mediaeval verse. With a profound knowledge and appreciation of his subject matter and a delicate control of bibliography he will please the scholar who has himself delved considerably into mediaeval literature even more than he will impress one who seeks a first introduction to it.

The translation of the book is very welcome. For the most part it is faithful to the text, but there are enough mistranslations, minor slips, and typographical errors to make the reader wary. On page 3 "might" should be changed to "may" and "illegible" to "unreadable." On page 4 read "de Labriolle's"; on page 11, "Braulio"; on page 50, "Iso"; on page 71, "Eugene." On page 14 the omission of a comma after "still further" renders the meaning unintelligible, and the sentence would benefit by recasting. On page 17 some of the matter on Gregory of Tours changes the original, e.g., *loyauté* does not mean "loyalty" but "honesty" (cf. also p. 24). On page 21 "Its powerfully compressed evocations" should read "Its powerfully evocative vignettes"; and it would be more faithful to the original

to retain the Catholic version "Sophonias" instead of "Zephaniah." On page 28 "apostolic" is the form to be used instead of "apostolical," and "one can find to mention" should replace "we could find." On page 30 "Desiderius" is to be used for the Lombard king, not the French form "Didier." On page 32 *"lila"* should read *"lilia."* On page 37, "we appreciate only Sedulius' works of simple . . . inspiration" should be changed to "we appreciate nothing so much in Sedulius as his verses of simple . . . inspiration." On page 39 "places the narratives of the Old Testament in opposition to the mythological fables" should be changed to "opposes the narratives of the Old Testament to the mythological fables." On page 40 what Hélin actually means in reference to rythmical verse is: ". . . this poetry however is popular in the sense that it is no longer founded on the quantity of the syllables (of which only those have an idea who have struggled with theoretical treatises at school). . . ." On page 46 "moniage" should be translated as "monastic." On page 48, ". . . he wrote to the court during a year of dearth" should be "he will write in the course of a year of dearth." On page 50 "in the Feast of the Holy Sacrament" should be "on the Feast of Corpus Christi," and on page 116 "Holy Sacrament" should be "Blessed Sacrament." On page 58 "authentic mark of having lived" should be "the mark of what is real and what has been lived," and "spiritual disposition" should be "disposition of mind." On page 59 "a Saint-Simon 'before letters'" (*avant la lettre*) should be rendered "before his time," and *Antapodosis* does not mean *"give the devil his due,"* but *"Tit for Tat."* On page 60 "romanesque" should be "romantic" and on page 107 "Roman" should be "Romanesque," and the adjective should be placed before "tympanums." On page 61 *"modul anima"* should read *"modulamina"* and in note 7, page 63, *"asperi"* should read *"aperi."* On page 70 "in whole" should be "in general." On page 75, "an intercession was asked for him" should be "his intercession was asked." On page 82 "Le complet épanouissment du vers rythmique" has become "the complete disappearance" instead of "the full flowering." The translator evidently was misled by the similarity of *évanouissment.* On page 91 "un poète prêtant une vie fraternelle au monde ailé" is translated "lending a brotherly hand to a winged world" instead of "ascribing social life to the winged world." On page 94 the sense of the original is betrayed by translating: "Walter of Châtillon was equally as good as versifier of the hexameters of the *Alexandreid*" instead of "was also the versifier. . . ." On page 97 *curé* should be translated not by "curate" but by parish priest, and the mangled Latin should read "Oratrus" and not "Oratus." In note 12, page 104 "fantastic" should be "whimsical." On page 110 for *"Pontificorum"* read *"pontificum."* On page 114 "on the stake" should be "at the stake." On page 116, "the latter was only raised so high" should be "only reaches such heights"; "St. Francis . . . was at the source of a spring"

should be "at the source of a stream"; "Fortunat" should be "Fortunatus"; and "Santa" should read "Sancta." Throughout the volume the capitalization in French, German, and Latin titles sins by excess in defiance of all rule.

The increased pagination and excellent typography make the book far easier to read than the compressed original and the brief index adds a valuable aid. A corrected edition could make the little volume almost a *livre de chevet* for those interested in mediaeval literature.

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER

*The Catholic University of America*

*Mediaeval Orvieto, the Political History of an Italian City-State, 1157-1334.* By Daniel Waley. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1952. Pp. xxv, 170. $4.00.)

A very mechanical way of supporting Dr. Waley's reference to the great number of books written about Venice and other Italian cities in contrast to the neglect of the cities of the Papal States is to point out that in one large library there are less than twenty entries in the card catalogue for Orvieto while there are about 200 each for only the history of Venice and Florence. Moreover, the secondary accounts about Orvieto are not reliable. This, then, is not just another book. Drawn mainly from the primary sources, it fills a gap in the best historical manner. In 1950 it was the Prince Consort Prize Essay.

In 1157 Pope Adrian IV granted Orvieto self-government. In 1334 the city fell into the hands of its first tyrant, Ermanno Monaldeschi. In that period of less than 200 years, there were three themes: the relations with the Papacy, the extension of territory, and the changes in government. With the exception of the Catharist heresy, relations between the Papacy and the city lay in the temporal domain. Territorial expansion proceeded during the latter half of the twelfth century and with increased momentum from 1198 to 1216 when the city's possessions "must have been nearly trebled." In extension, government, and the Guelf-Ghibelline struggle, Orvieto was having experiences similar to other communes in central Italy. During the early period the flexibility of governmental institutions was evident. In less than forty years, 1157-1194, four changes took place in the number of consuls, and consuls did not always succeed others. They were being replaced by the rector. It was not until 1250 that the *popolo* became important. Declining during the Angevin period, it was aroused by Ranieri della Greca and continued to be important until 1322.

Italian cities were, however, individual and the author points out some of the special characteristics of Orvieto. One was the leadership of two families: the Monaldeschi dominated the Guelfs, the Filippeschi, the Ghibellines. Another rare feature among the communes was the unanimity in Orvieto during 1292-1303, years of "Internal Unity and a Strong Foreign Policy." Then the Guelf-Ghibelline struggle began again and in 1313 the Ghibellines were finally defeated. The Guelf victory was followed by a decline. Rebellions in subject towns, loss of their control, borrowing of money, and the replacing of the *popolo* by the nobles preceded the beginning of tyranny.

In addition to the careful narration of events and evaluations, each reader should be grateful for all the useful aids included, but especially for the map, the appendixes, and the genealogical tables.

MARY LUCILLE SHAY

*University of Illinois*

*The Hundred Years War.* By Edouard Perroy. Translated from the French by W. B. Wells. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. 376. $6.00.)

Professor Perroy's stimulating volume fills a gap in the history of the late Middle Ages, although in the opinion of Professor Douglas of the University of Bristol who introduces the English translation, "The Hundred Years War, as a whole, still awaits its English historian." What he means is that while the study is unique and valuable in seeking to bridge both countries, it does not reveal as sure a grasp of English history as it does of French. For example, John of Gaunt hardly "found shelter in Scotland" during the "terrible" peasant rising of 1381.

Few will question Perroy's insistence that Guienne was the cause of the war: the French fear lest England establish sovereignty over the territory, English suspicion that France planned to exclude them. Thus the war broke over a feudal issue, which the ambitions of the Lancastrians turned into a dynastic struggle in the fifteenth century. The war lasted so long because neither government, until the end, possessed sufficient strength to marshall its country's resources. Yet though money won the war, Professor Perroy strangely ignores the financial contribution of Jacques Coeur. The English victories sprang from their numerical inferiority which forced them "to resort to stratagems unworthy of knights: concealment along hedges, ambushes in woodland. . . ." None of these battles was crucial. Agincourt "was only one raid more after so many like it."

A more telling blow was struck by the Black Death. The author graphically describes the social and economic havoc wrought by this plague, by the war, and by the pitiless plundering of the *routiers* and *écorcheurs* who "spared nothing, except the walls of the towns which they could not take by assault."

The author weaves his way skillfully through the maze of family relationships and feuds. Marriages, wrung dry of all romance, served as instruments of diplomacy or as means of acquiring fiefs. He hangs a picture, possibly a bit overdrawn, on each of the sovereigns: John, exemplar of chivalry, though no more than a glittering mediocrity; Henry V, cruel and deceitful as an Italian despot; Charles VII, a graceless degenerate. Duguesclin's success he credits to Charles V, for whenever that captain disobeyed his king's orders and fought a pitched battle, he suffered defeat. Many striking incidents are related, such as the invasion of the dauphin's (Charles V) bedroom by Marcel's supporters, who killed the prince's friends before his eyes and forced him to don a hood of blue and red, the colors of the Parisian burgesses.

Yet only slight justice does the author do Joan of Arc, whom he has leading the dauphin's troops in scarcely more than half a page. One must conclude that it was routine in the Middle Ages for peasant girls to be entrusted with the direction of grand strategy. Though Professor Perroy insists on the decisive role of tactics and weapons in the war, Joan's accomplishment at Orléans was not remarkable since "at that time the art of war did not amount to much. Courage, confidence, and boldness readily made up for it."

The war ended unofficially in 1453, although it required all of Louis XI's ingenuity and less ingenious policy on Charles the Bold's part to prevent its reopening.

JOSEPH H. DAHMUS

*Pennsylvania State College*

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Age of the Baroque, 1610-1660.* By Carl J. Friedrich. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1952. Pp. xv, 367. $5.00.)

Professor Friedrich's work is the latest addition to the projected twenty-volume Rise of Modern Europe Series which will eventually supply a detailed conspectus of European political and cultural history from 1250 to the present. This volume deals with the period from 1610 to 1660, to which the author, or perhaps the editor, has attached the not entirely accurate name, the Age of the Baroque. Admitting himself that this age can really be traced back as far as 1550, and forward to 1750, he at times seems almost to bend over backward in interpreting the various events of

his period as expressive of the baroque spirit. The baroque, to him, though primarily thought of as a style of art, is the expression in all the phases of life of a basic attitude built on sweeping extremes of every type, with power and the search to obtain it as its dynamic essence. There is no doubt that this period possesses such traits, yet one still feels that the author, by his constant reference to this characteristic mark of his age, at times strains his thesis.

Mr. Friedrich sets the stage in his first chapter, competently describing the Europe of 1610, an age when the Catholic Reformation was in full swing with high hopes of regaining the souls and territories lost to the faith; a time, likewise, when the empire and the free cities, the local estates within the various countries, still exercised an active force. Some hundred pages are then devoted to a summary of the baroque spirit as it expressed itself in literature, art, music, in religion, philosophy, and the sciences. A period of seething activity, this was the age of Bernini, Rembrandt, and Velasquez, of the Jesuits and Jansenists, of Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Harvey, and many more: truly, as the author calls it, an "age of the giants."

But the heart of this book, as well as the heart of the age, is concerned with that terrible struggle, the Thirty Years' War. Professor Friedrich gives us a masterly presentation of this confused and sometimes confusing struggle, which was the last attempt of both Catholics and Protestants to gain ascendancy in the empire and Europe, and which ended in a draw, due largely to the national-minded Richelieu and his minion, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. Friedrich re-emphasizes the religious aspect of these wars, maintaining in the face of some liberal historians, that "for baroque man religion and politics were cut from the same cloth." It was only toward the end of the struggle that the secular spirit emerged triumphant.

The latter part of the book contrasts two states, the modern state absolute, represented by the France of Richelieu and Mazarin, which had been efficiently consolidated and centralized in this fifty-year period, with England, the modern state limited, which is portrayed as resisting the absolutist tendency of the Stuarts and establishing constitutional limits chiefly as the result of the Puritan civil war. In Friedrich's view, Oliver Cromwell was "the greatest single individual of the two generations." In one further chapter, linking these two, the author describes the development of the eastern European countries during this period.

By way of comment, it might be said that the author mars an otherwise scholarly piece of work by occasional tendentiousness. At times he links the Church and its representatives with the forces of superstition; in discussing the Jansenist controversy he gives the impression that the Jesuits were the innovators of a new lax doctrine, rather than the defenders of

the traditional moderation of the Church, in contrast to whom the Jansenists were really the extremists, tending in the direction of Calvinism. The old chestnut of the Galileo case as a struggle between the forces of progress and superstition is once more dragged in, overlooking sounder interpretations like that of Henry S. Lucas who, while admitting that churchmen of the time were guilty of injustice, nevertheless, makes clear that no official pronouncement was given and that Galileo's own lack of prudence brought most of his troubles upon him. Finally, the author appears to make modern constitutional democracy too much the result of Puritan influences alone, practically ignoring the democratic traditions inherited from the Middle Ages.

Keeping in mind these flaws, this volume can be considered a convenient synthesis of the period of the Thirty Years' War, no doubt the most complete and up-to-date one-volume account in English. The book closes with a valuable bibliographical essay.

WILLIAM KELLER

*Seton Hall University*

*Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert:* I, *Die Grundlagen,* vierte auflage; II, *Monarchie und Volkssouveränität,* zweite auflage; III, *Erfahrungswissenschaften und Technik,* zweite auflage; IV, *Die religiösen Kräfte,* zweite auflage. By Franz Schnabel. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co. 1947-1951. Pp. xi, 628; 414; ix, 500; xii, 617. DM. 25, 18, 20, 28.)

The reappearance in print of these volumes, suppressed by the Hitler government fifteen years ago, has come as good news to those acquainted with them in earlier editions. It is even better news that the author has been working on the later volumes and that he hopes, despite the difficulties in the way of careful research in post-war Germany, to complete his task.

The chief merit of Schnabel's *Deutsche Geschichte* rests in the rounded picture it provides of German life and thought prior to 1848. Like Ranke, the author believes that universal history is the true history. Not only does he analyze and summarize the political, economic, religious, and intellectual developments of the period; he also reveals their interaction on each other. Proud though Schnabel is of Germany's unique contributions in philosophy, science, and literature, he is careful to point out Germany's debt for better and for worse to western European culture. Along with Friedrich Meinecke, Gerhard Ritter, and others, Schnabel has proven that modern German historians, in contrast to their predecessors, can present a balanced and calm picture of their country's past. Moreover,

Schnabel is certainly the first German Catholic historian who has treated wide areas of religious history with the approval of large numbers of non-Catholic critics.

The author's interpretation of the nineteenth century is stated and restated in his four volumes. It was not a period of "new ideas" or of "great men." The middle class which was to shape the course of the century merely intensified and broadened the influence of pre-existing ideas and forces. Its achievements in government, science, and technology raised the level of human dignity by increasing political freedom, improving material conditions, and widening knowledge. Nevertheless, these developments were to lead after the middle of the century to the victory of secularism, relativism, materialism, and individualism at the expense of religion, absolute values, culture, and the community.

In his first volume, Schnabel shows that at the opening of the century Germany had prospects of a brighter future. Her greatest thinkers and writers—Lessing, Kant, Goethe, Herder, and Schiller—had taken much of the good and rejected most of what was unsound in the French Enlightenment. Though sharing its exaggerated estimate of man's powers and neglecting religion, they criticized its overemphasis upon reason and restored the rights of the will and emotions. Then the German romantics, though initially ultra-individualistic and subjective in their thought, led the way to a reconsideration of traditional institutions and values; the Catholic Church, mediaeval corporative institutions, and the German nation now won new appreciation. The conquest of Germany by Napoleon, the personification of enlightened despotism, and especially the shocking defeat of Prussia, offered patriotic Germans the opportunity to revive their nation through the translation of these ideals and values into political fact. Following closely the work of Friedrich Meinecke, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat,* Schnabel shows how Stein, Scharnhorst, and Humboldt tried to reform Prussia as the first step toward the reformation and liberation of Germany as a whole. They hoped to reach their goal by giving the individual greater freedom but at the same time providing him with a sense of responsibility to his state and nation. The liberation of the peasants, the introduction of self-government in the cities, the opening of the officers' corps to the bourgeiosie, the introduction of universal military service, and the emphasis upon a broad education and personal initiative in the secondary schools, were all part of the program to change the burgher from the apathetic subject of a soulless and mechanistic state into an alert and responsible Prussian citizen and German patriot.

Schnabel's account of the reform movement provides the background to his second volume which treats the conflict between the absolute monarch and the advocates of constitutional government. The promise of the

reform period was soon dissipated after 1815. In the south some progress was made because the former allies of Napoleon had already introduced the civil code and equality before the law; for reasons of state the monarchs gave constitutions and established parliaments. The victory of reaction was nearly complete, however, not only in Metternich's Austria but also in Prussia. The Prussian government refused to carry out its earlier promises of a constitution and national representation. The Junkers were permitted to depress many of the recently freed peasants to the status of landless day laborers and to regain their monopoly of the officer ranks in the army. Finally, the government, while retaining the emphasis upon philosophy and the classics, took the life out of Humboldt's education program by emphasizing the importance of drill and learning by rote in the gymnasium.

The failure of the reform movement lay in the weakness of the middle class, its lack of unity, and its separation from the lower classes. It could only attain its end through the development of natural science and technology, the source of the middle class's power in the later nineteenth century. In his third volume the author traces the concurrent growth of natural science, technology, and scientific history in the first half of the century. All three depended upon observation and experience and were concerned with the problems of this world. Though lacking in a strong scientific tradition, Germany stood to the fore in medicine, physics, and chemistry by 1850. Her advance in technology was even slower because of her lack of scientific education, her political and economic disunity, and her lack of wealth. By 1848, however, the imitation of English techniques in the coal, iron, and textile industries, state assistance in legislation and education, the *Zollverein*, and the building of railroads, provided the foundations for Germany's later rise to power as an industrial state.

Schnabel's appraisal of these achievements is eminently sound. The accomplishments of German technology were to save large numbers from the painful necessity of having to seek gainful employment abroad. The new history overcame many of the crass assumptions of the Enlightenment and threw new light on the Middle Ages. It provided a powerful weapon for Catholic scholars who wanted to prove the continuity and organic development of Catholic doctrine. Most of the scientists, engineers, and historians had received classical educations or had come from Christian backgrounds or both, so that they managed to retain their perspective and a regard for values. Nevertheless, the rapid increase in scientific and historical knowledge and the expansion of industry were to lead in the later century to an overwhelming concern with material things at the expense of religion and culture.

In his fourth volume Schnabel reveals that he has a high opinion of the accomplishments of the Catholic and Protestant churches in the first

half-century, although he has already presaged the triumph of secularism. In contrast to many of their predecessors, the bishops and priests were men of real religious faith and energetic leaders of their people. They encouraged the revival of popular devotions, pilgrimages, and missions; they used the new rights of association and free speech to unify their people and to make them better conversant with their faith by means of the printing press. But the Church lacked the means to undertake effective work among the city masses; some states hampered its efforts to reach the workers by missions. The state's interference in the affairs of the Church and the animosity of liberalism caused the hierarchy to stress greater reliance upon Rome, stricter discipline, uniformity in devotional practice, and adherence to traditional practices in clerical education. Something was lost in this emphasis upon authority, conformity, and traditional practice, in Schnabel's estimation, but he asserts that the bishops had no other alternative. The Church lost members, but it was able to preserve its unity and heritage in the storms that were to follow.

Schnabel's analysis of German Protestantism leaves no doubt in the reader's mind as to the deep religious feeling and the vitality of the orthodox churches and pietism. The renewed anti-Catholic feeling in Germany was due in good measure to the revival of Protestantism. But the Protestant churches were not able to marshall their forces for an attack on or a successful defense against the irreligious forces of the century. Their origins usually prevented effective unions of Lutheran and Calvinist communities. Their historical studies led liberal Protestants into conflicts with orthodox churchmen. Pietist circles throughout Germany showed marked evidence of deep devotion and Christian charity, but they remained circles and revealed no understanding of a Christian social mission. The orthodox churches were too closely identified with the state to appeal to the masses. Moreover, the well-to-do and cultured classes manifested a growing indifference to religion, although the churches were energetically striving to preserve the existing social order that made possible their way of life!

In closing, this reviewer can only voice one complaint about this otherwise outstanding work—it is written in German! It is sad but true that this model of Catholic scholarship will remain unknown to most American students until a translation appears.

JOHN K. ZEENDER
*University of Massachusetts*

*Catholic Political Thought, 1789-1848.* Texts selected with an introduction by Béla Menczer. (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 1952. Pp. viii, 205. 18s.)

This is a collection of short texts, ranging from about fifteen to thirty pages each, from nine Catholics who wrote on the problem of authority and liberty in the first half of the nineteenth century. The selections in

each case are well made for the purpose at hand. Donoso Cortés' famous speech on dictatorship and a few key passages on socialism, e.g., are the best selections possible from the Spanish statesman's work. Or again, Lecture XVIII from Friedrich von Schlegel's *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* is an excellent choice.

No one is likely to quarrel with Mr. Menczer in his selection from each man's work. But his selection of authors is another matter. Anyone brave enough to choose nine authors from among many leaves himself open to complaint from those who object both to omissions and to inclusions. The nine men chosen by the editor are: Joseph de Maistre, Vicomte de Bonald, François René de Chateaubriand, Honoré de Balzac, Friedrich von Schlegel, Prince Clemens Metternich, Juan Donoso Cortés, Jaime Balmes, and Louis Veuillot. One could quarrel with individual choices by claiming that Chateaubriand or Metternich were Catholics writing on political subjects rather than formulators or expressers of Catholic thought. But to argue over individual choices is, perhaps, small-minded.

We do object, however, to a "stacking of the deck" by these selections in such a way as to give an unbalanced picture of Catholic thought in this period. We do not quarrel with the men included, although some of them are not very important and others are not notably Catholic, but we do object to the omission of men like Joseph Goerres, Frédéric Ozanam, Bishop Dupanloup, Charles Montalembert, Père Lacordaire, and others who belong to the "liberty" camp as against the "authority" group. Catholic thought seeks a middle ground on this delicate subject, and to omit every writer from one side is to give the impression that Catholic thought—rather than certain Catholics—belonged unreservedly to the glorifiers of authority rather than liberty. The works of men like Montalembert and Lacordaire, though daring and, perhaps, rash in their day, read much more like the encyclicals of the last half century than do the works of men like de Bonald or de Maistre. The point is that both the lovers of liberty and the preservers of authority are within the Catholic tradition and, therefore, a collection of texts on this subject called "Catholic Political Thought" should strike a balance between the two groups.

Had this book been called "The Political Thought of Some Catholics" we would have nothing but praise to offer for it. The works included deserve attention in our own day. They are important both as historical information and as suggested keys for our own approach to this perennial problem of authority and liberty. The editor has prefaced each selection with a few pages of compact information about the author. The most important part of the book, however, is his own introductory essay of almost sixty pages. It is an essay on liberty and authority in the Catholic tradition, sketching through the subject in an indepedent, frequently provocative way from the time of Bossuet and Pascal. Mr. Menczer's judg-

ments are independent and sometimes untraditional, but they are always thoughtful and never to be taken lightly. This essay alone makes the book valuable, for it is much more than an introduction to the texts selected by the author. It is itself a contribution to the subject of authority and liberty in the Catholic tradition.

THOMAS P. NEILL

*St. Louis University*

*Revolutions of 1848: A Social History.* By Priscilla Robertson. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1952. Pp. xi, 464. $6.00.)

The century of the revolutions of 1848 produced many articles and books on the events and importance of that *annus mirabilis* when history failed to turn, and the volume under review is another in the still-expanding series. It is the work of the daughter of the late Preserved Smith, one of the most distinguished historians of his generation, and its purpose is to recount the familiar story in terms of what it meant for the common man, rather than the leaders. The result is a volume in the field of social history with plenty of local color and emphasis on the dramatic to make it good reading. The critical bibliography testifies to serious and prolonged labor, yet the book adds little, either by way of new facts or interpretations, to what historical scholars already know. The author probably would be the first to say that she wrote for a much larger audience, an altogether laudable and worthwhile objective. About half of the book deals with France and the Austrian Empire; about a fifth with Italy, and a little less with Germany; and there are a few pages devoted to English Chartism and unrest in Ireland.

Though part of a general movement, the revolutions varied somewhat from country to country. In Paris alone was there enough working class strength to make socialism a possible objective. Advocates of a democratic republic fought hard, in a bitter class struggle, with the champions of a welfare state for the proletariat. In the German states, the middle class concentrated on civil rights; the agitation included the demand for national unity; and the rivalry between Prussia and Austria for leadership proved fatal. In Italy, it was necessary to drive the Austrians from the peninsula, and the struggle was especially dramatic because it involved such colorful characters as Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Radetzky, the octogenarian champion of Habsburg reaction, and the role of Piedmont and the Papal States. The Pope was finally restored to Rome by the French whom he distrusted and feared.

In the Austrian Empire, "the China of Europe," Magyars eventually fought with Slavs, and Croats led the invasion of Hungary. In Vienna the famous Academic Legion of the students was under the influence of

the theologian, Anton Füster, an opponent of clerical celibacy, who later was a political refugee in the United States, where he taught school, served as "speaker" of a group of German freethinkers in Boston, and prepared his reminiscences of the stirring Vienna days.

In Italy, the head of the Catholic Church was directly involved, both as a temporal ruler and as the spiritual father of millions of Catholics of different political allegiances. Mazzini, who denied that he was either an atheist or a socialist, was determined to build a "Rome of the People," and to confiscate the great holdings of the Church. In France, the Roman Catholic hierarchy had little sympathy for the Orleans dynasty and the Archbishop of Paris co-operated with the provisional government and lost his life during the revolution. Moreover, various clerical leaders were disturbed by the growing evils of the Industrial Revolution and, therefore, did not oppose national workshops for the unemployed even though they smacked of socialism. In the end, however, the clergy cooled toward the republic and alienated many workers by supporting the "party of order," of Louis Napoleon. Incidentally, the bibliography does not include Jean Leflon's *L'église de France et la revolution de 1848.*

The author's conclusions do not necessitate any significant revision of current interpretations of 1848. Free speech, good will, and wealth, the author repeats, saved England from anything more revolutionary than Chartism. Many of the demands of 1848 were achieved later through other means than revolution, and so the author concludes that not the aims, but the methods of 1848 jeopardized the social structure; that the revolutions were beaten down physically by frightened conservatives and intellectually by the theories of Karl Marx, which forecast a growing class struggle. Other observations, by way of explaining the revolution, such as the reference to the "release of old resentments," reveal the present vogue of psychoanalytical terminology, but add nothing that has not been said in simpler terms. Was there ever a revolution which was not a "release of old resentments"?

CARL WITTKE

*Western Reserve University*

## AMERICAN HISTORY

*Cavalier in the Wilderness. The Story of the Explorer and Trader Louis Juchereau de St. Denis.* By Ross Phares. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1952. Pp. xiv, 276. $3.50.)

In reading a work of history one is naturally interested in the author. Ross Phares is a native of Louisiana. He attended school in Mexico and at present he is professor of English and chairman of the division of languages and literature at East Texas Baptist College in Marshall, Texas.

It is not strange, then, that he should be interested in a character who played a prominent role in the early history of Louisiana, Texas, and Mexico.

*Cavalier in the Wilderness* is the story of Louis Juchereau de St. Denis who in 1699, as a junior French officer, accompanied Iberville, his cousin, to the newly-established French colony at Biloxi. The narrative follows his career through nearly half a century of heroic adventure in the new world. Woven about St. Denis as the central figure is the story of the early years of the French colony of Louisiana and its struggle to make its existence profitable to France by the establishment of trade with the Indians and the Spanish, the story of the Spanish whose government centered in Mexico looked with jealous eyes upon the French occupation and activities, and the story of the zeal of the early missionaries in founding missions in Texas.

It is history written in a popular style, and while for the most part devoid of references to the sources, yet it gives the impression of a work written by a man who has done much study of original documents, sources evidently confusing and at times even contradictory, and who has drawn from these sources a live and vivid picture of the places, people, and underlying politics that made the early history of Louisiana and Texas. The attitude toward the Church is objective. The zeal and earnestness of the Spanish missionaries is brought out well. The author shows rather good understanding of Catholic customs and he treats these sympathetically.

St. Denis, the hero of the narrative, was evidently an extraordinary man. He showed this in his ability to gain the confidence of the Indian as few others have been able to do, to sway the Spaniards, to gain their good will, and to open successful trade against great odds. He was a bold soldier, an understanding friend of the Indian, a successful trader, who by his success was able to preserve the foothold of the French in Louisiana.

✠ Richard O. Gerow
*Bishop of Natchez*

*Louis XVI, le congrès Américain et le Canada, 1774-1789.* By Marcel Trudel. (Quebec: Publications de l'Université Laval: Éditions du Quartier Latin. 1949. Pp. xlii, 259.)

Professor Trudel of Laval University has performed a service of importance for all students of the diplomatic history of the United States and of Canada. For too long a time historians of varied repute have aired entirely erroneous conclusions with respect to the policy of France toward Canada during the course of the American Revolution. Too often have

these "conclusions" been based upon a sort of romantic presupposition that ties of blood and culture operated to impose on France a policy of *revanche* toward Canada. There was nothing romantic about French policy. Stated simply, it was to leave Canada in British hands. French intervention in the war between Britain and her colonies had for its objectives the recovery of French prestige in Europe, the diminution of British trade (and the enlargement of French trade) with North America through the establishment of the independence of the United States, the preservation and guarantee of French fishing rights off Newfoundland, and the extension of French control in the West Indies. "Revenge," which many ill-informed writers have set down as the motivation of French policy, played no part in the practical calculations which formed the bases of French conduct. Neither did the desire to recover New France, lost to England by the disastrous Treaty of Paris of 1763.

French propagandists during the American Revolution did not hesitate to appeal to what they thought might be the pro-French sympathies of the inhabitants of Canada. This, however, did not constitute proof of the desire of France to recapture Canada. (Nor did the propaganda succeed!) On the other hand, precise statements of policy by Vergennes, the French foreign minister, made unequivocally clear the determination of France to leave Canada in British hands. Gérard, French minister to the United States, was so informed. Lafayette, whose youthful enthusiasm led him to suggest the recovery of Canada, was quickly acquainted with the fact that such calculations could have no place in French thinking.

Many Americans, exhibiting a turn of mind later to be characterized by the phrase "Manifest Destiny," wished to bring Canada into the union of states, and desired French help in doing so. They had not waited for French intervention to broach the subject to the Canadians. Benjamin Franklin and Father John Carroll had been sent by the Continental Congress in 1775 to persuade Canada to join with the other colonies in revolt against Britain. That attempt had failed, but the basic idea remained very much alive. After 1778 some of the most determined efforts of the French diplomats were directed toward curbing these American ambitions, and toward securing concentration upon the main objective of the war—freeing the thirteen states from English control.

M. Trudel has made all these facts clear in this book—the first full-length documented study of the three-way relationship among Canada, the United States, and France during the revolution. He has done a superb job. The volume is written almost exclusively from original sources. No major depository of pertinent information seems to have been neglected. The value of the book is enhanced by the inclusion of complete documentation, of an exhaustive and well-balanced critical bibliography, and of a complete index of proper names.

Professor Trudel has made one unfortunate slip on page 125 where he first refers to the appointment of a French diplomatic envoy to the United States. He gives the name of the French minister as "Conrad-Alexandre Gérard de Rayneval." "De Rayneval" was no part of Gérard's name or title. The envoy might have referred to himself as "Gérard de Munster" had he so wished (which he did not). Such a slip would be inconsequential were it not for the confusing fact that C. A. Gérard had a brother named Joseph Mathias Gérard de Rayneval, and for the further confusing fact that Gérard de Rayneval succeeded C. A. Gérard as *premier commis* of the French foreign office when C. A. Gérard came to the United States as minister. In other words, both men were intimately concerned with the making and administration of French policy at the same time—one in France, the other in America. Both were deeply involved at various times in negotiations affecting Canada. Many able historians have confused the identities of the two men, to the utter mystification of many readers. M. Trudel, beyond his initial slip, does not seem to have done so. It is probable that only a peevish reviewer would call attention to such a slip in a book otherwise so admirable!

JOHN J. MENG

*Hunter College of the City of New York*

*John Adams and the Prophets of Progress.* By Zoltán Haraszti. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 362. $5.00.)

Our knowledge of the real John Adams, statesman, thinker, writer and critic, is still incomplete, but Zoltán Haraszti, the keeper of rare books in the Boston Public Library (where the main portion of Adams' library is preserved), has added much to that knowledge in the present work, marked throughout by painstaking scholarship and thoughtful analysis.

The debate which Adams conducted with the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century—writers like Bolingbroke, Rousseau, Abbé de Mably, Turgot, d'Alembert, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Condorcet—in his marginal comment on their works shed light on his political creed and show, far better than his formal writings, his reaction to men and events in the age of reason. Moreover, they point to those facets of his personality—tendency to criticize, biting wit, fondness for unorthodox opinions, and self-righteousness—which made him unpopular in his day and neglected in ours.

Adams feared the growth of despotism, for which he held the *philosophes* partly to blame. "The fundamental article of my political creed," he wrote

in old age, "is that despotism, or unlimited sovereignty, or absolute power, is the same in a majority of a popular assembly, an aristocratical council, an oligarchic junto, and a single emperor. Equally arbitrary, cruel, bloody, and in every respect diabolical." His antidote was balance in government. "Representations, instead of collections, of the people," he wrote, "a total separation of the executive from the legislative power, and of the judicial from both. . . ."

Mr. Haraszti's prefatory chapters on the man, his philosophy and writings are well done and too much cannot be said in favor of his organization of the marginalia to create real dialogues, which emphasize Adams' many epigrams, thundering denunciations and, it must be added, frequent irrelevancies. Adams loved the aphorism, such as "The majority is omnipotent, but not omniscient" and "Coligny seems to have had religion, but his conscience was very ambitious." He could dismiss Condorcet with "as superficial in legislation as abstruse in geometry" and blandly blunder with "as mere a monk as Loyola."

The book has thorough notes, facsimile pages bearing the Adams marginalia, an adequate index, and is remarkably free from typographical error. Only two, both minor, were noted by this reviewer. Mr. Haraszti, in a work to which scholars will give high rank, has pointed the way to much that needs to be done to bring John Adams to his proper place in the history of political philosophy.

ALLAN J. DOHERTY

*Boston Latin School*

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

The thirty-third annual meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association will be held at the Hotel Mayflower, in Washington on December 28-30. Dr. John H. Kennedy of the United States Air Force Headquarters and his committee have completed arrangements for an attractive program which will include the customary joint session with the American Historical Association and a new feature, namely, a panel discussion on American Catholic historical sites and monuments.

The eighth annual institute on the preservation and administration of archives was held at the National Archives in Washington from June 16 to July 11. A visit with President Truman gave a new aspect to the sessions. The twenty-two registered members included the Reverends Edward L. Binsfeld, librarian of St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio; Emilien Lamirande, archivist of Archives Deschatelets, Scholasticat Saint-Joseph, Ottawa; John Lapensée, provincial archivist of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Montreal, and Sisters M. Kostka Baker and M. Consuelo Heaps, both of Mount Gallitzin, Baden, Pennsylvania. On the afternoon of July 7 a visit was made to the Department of Archives and Manuscripts of the Catholic University of America which included lectures on American religious and educational archives and a discussion of related problems.

The archaeological excavations at Fort Ste. Marie in Ontario, which began twelve years ago, have made genuine progress and it was recently announced by the government of Ontario that the restoration of the stockades and buildings is now more than half completed. This famous site where the Jesuit martyrs lie buried at the river bank near by has had the careful attention of scholars from the Royal Ontario Museum, the University of Western Ontario, and the Society of Jesus. Fathers D. Hegarty and J. Lalley, S.J., are charged with continuing the restoration of the ancient fort, which may take ten or more years to complete. The outlines of the original palisades indicate an area of 80,000 square feet. To date twenty-one bodies have been found, some still grasping rosaries in their hands. The history of Fort Ste. Marie dates back to 1625 when a party of Jesuit missionaries journeyed 800 miles from Quebec to minister to the 30,000 Huron Indians of what is now the Province of Ontario.

The lack of endowment in most Catholic colleges and universities has serious effects in the promotion of research and publication in history and the social sciences. The funds available either to support the teacher who can be relieved of teaching duties or to publish the results of his researches must come from sources outside the college and university. Even in com-

petition for the funds offered by the national foundations, the Catholic scholar is frequently handicapped because he has not had personal funds with which to advance his study to the point where application to a foundation is feasible. Some foundations, further, feel that they cannot justify aid to a project that has a religious character. To overcome this major handicap to scholarship, Catholic college and university public relations officers should take up more seriously the job of interesting prospective donors in these projects. Another solution is the creation of a national Catholic research foundation administered, perhaps, by qualified Catholic business men.

A report on the Anglo-American conference of historians held in London, July 9-14, 1951, appears in the May issue of the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research. Summaries of the addresses and of the papers are presented. Stephan Kuttner of the Catholic University of America read a paper on "Early English Canonists." There were several other papers of interest to mediaevalists, some of which are being published. D. Hay of the University of Edinburgh made a plea for the recognition of the interval from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries as a new historical period.

The same issue of the *Bulletin* publishes digests of several theses prepared at universities in Britain.

The fifty-sixth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science was held in Philadelphia at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel on April 18 and 19. More than 500 delegates from all parts of the world attended the two-day meeting, which was devoted to the general theme "The National Interest—Alone or with Others?" As these annual meetings are regularly concerned with a discussion of world affairs with especial emphasis upon the relation of the United States to them, the topics this year provoked some lively debate and pointed questioning. Prominent among the speakers were: Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party, Paul-Henri Spaak, former Premier of Belgium, Senator John Sparkman of Alabama, Representative John M. Vorys of Ohio, Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, Alberto Lleras, Director General of the Pan American Union. The Ambassador from India, B. R. Sen, the Ambassador from Australia, Percy C. Spender, and the Yugoslavian Ambassador to the United Nations, Ales Bebler, also participated. Individual sessions were given over to a searching review of the relation of the national interest to American foreign policy, to the Atlantic community, and to the world community. Attempts were made to define the concept of "national interest," to delineate its specific application to areas of conflicting national interests, and to reveal the nature and extent of the world community's reactions to the American concept. The proceedings of the

annual meeting were published in the July, 1952, issue of the Academy's *Annals*. The American Catholic Historical Association was represented by Robert E. Quigley of Philadelphia.

The History Teachers' Club, at their annual meeting at the University of Notre Dame on July 11-13, elected Sister M. Raymond, O.S.U., of St. Gerard High School, Lima, Ohio, as president; the Reverend Kenneth Mayer, O.S.B., of Delbarton School, Morristown, New Jersey, as vice president; Miss Mercedes Muenz of Notre Dame, as secretary-treasurer; and Sister M. de Sales, S.N.D., of Notre Dame Academy, Toledo, Ohio, as editor of the club's quarterly *Bulletin*. The club is composed principally of high school teachers of history and is devoted to the exchange of methods and aids in teaching.

The managing editor of the REVIEW left Washington on June 16 on a tour of South America which terminated on August 1. During these six weeks Father Ellis visited Bogotá, Colombia, Lima, Peru, Santiago, Chile, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Montevideo, Uruguay, and São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, where he lectured to various groups on the Catholic Church in the United States, American Catholic universities, the life of Cardinal Gibbons, and the work being done by historical societies in the United States. In Bogotá he spoke to the students of St. Joseph's Seminary, the archdiocesan seminary, the Universidad de los Andes, the Centro Colombiano-Norteamericano, and was received by the officers of the Academia Colombiana de Historia and the dean and professors of the ecclesiastical faculty of the Universidad Javeriana. In Lima lectures were delivered at the Universidad de San Marcos, the Instituto Cultural Peruano Norteamericano, the Instituto Riva Aguero of the Catholic University of Peru, and an informal talk was given at the Peruvian Society of History. In Santiago a program had been arranged for July 4 to commemorate the anniversary of American independence by the Catholic University of Chile, and on this occasion Father Ellis shared the platform with William Rex Crawford, professor of sociology in the University of Pennsylvania. Talks were also given before the recently organized Women's University Club of Santiago and the American Society of Chile. By the time he reached Buenos Aires the schools were practically all on their mid-year holiday, but he paid a visit to the Instituto de Cultura Religiosa Superior which is a promising school for girls taught by the Religiosas de la Compañia del Divino Maestro, a native congregation. In the capital of Argentina a visit was also made to the interesting Casa de la Empleada, a religious and social center for working girls, which was founded in 1922 by the Most Reverend Miguel De Andrea, Auxiliary Bishop of Buenos Aires, and which has enrolled on its lists around 27,000 girls of the poorer classes who pay only four pesos a month for breakfast,

the services of a chapel with daily Mass, a medical and dental clinic, a library, recreation rooms, and a summer holiday of two weeks in the organization's camp in the country. In Buenos Aires Father Ellis profited from a lengthy visit with Guillermo Furlong, S.J., the distinguished historian of the Church in Argentina, who is the author of a number of scholarly works, among the most recent *Orígenes del arte tipográfico en América* (Buenos Aires, 1947), and a chapter in the volume, *Etapas del catolicismo argentino* (Buenos Aires, 1952). In the company of Father Furlong he visited the Seminary of the Immaculate Conception which serves the Archdiocese of Buenos Aires and some of its suffragan sees; this institution, as well as the Seminary of Christ the King of the Archdiocese of Montevideo, is conducted by the Jesuit Fathers. In the capital of Uruguay a lecture was given at the Alianza Cultural Uruguaya-EE.UU. on Catholicism in the United States, and the same subject was used in São Paulo for a lecture in the social hall of the American Oblate Fathers which is attached to their new Chapel of Our Lady Help of Christians. Here in São Paulo visits were made to the Casa Roosevelt which houses the Brazilian-American Institute, to the Catholic University of São Paulo, which was established in 1946, and to the Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, which serves the Archdiocese of São Paulo and a number of its suffragan sees. On his final stop at Rio de Janeiro Father Ellis was received by Pedro Belisario Velloso Rebello, S.J., Rector of the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, an institution which was opened in 1941, and he made visits as well to the interdiocesan St. Joseph Seminary for the Archdiocese of Rio de Janeiro and its six suffragan sees, and to the Instituto Brasil-Estados Unidos, the executive secretary of which at present is Thomas E. Downey, associate professor of Latin American history in the University of Notre Dame, who is on a two-year leave of absence from his teaching duties. During his visits to the seven cities mentioned Father Ellis also paid courtesy calls on the local ordinaries and the apostolic nuncios and contacted local historical groups wherever possible, such as the Academia Nacional de la Historia in Buenos Aires, where he was greeted by two of Argentina's leading historians, Drs. Ricardo Levene and Carlos A. Pueyrredón, and a number of their colleagues.

An illustrated biographical series of the thirty Archbishops of Mexico has recently been published in that capital. A single card is devoted to each archbishop. It contains a good illustration copied from either authentic paintings or photographs together with a brief résumé of the outstanding events in the life of the prelate. The information is reliable, but it is selected more for the purpose of edification than of instruction. Orders for this series, *Galeria de Arzobispos de Mexico,* should be sent to the editor

Joaquín de la Barrera, Paseo de la Reforma 12 Desp. 509, Mexico D. F. Each set costs twelve pesos.

The Institute of Early American History and Culture has announced that it is prepared to provide a limited number of grants-in-aid of research to individuals who are conducting research projects in the field of American history prior to 1815. The institute likewise announces an annual prize of $500 for a published book in the field of early American history and culture. More detailed information on these matters may be had by addressing the director of the institute at Box 1298, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The University of Notre Dame Committee on International Relations has received another grant of $65,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation for its program of research. During the three years the committee has been functioning, four volumes of studies have been published and five other volumes are nearing the publication stage. Besides these books, the committee has conducted several symposia and published several articles, chiefly in the *Review of Politics*. The chairman of the committee is Waldemar Gurian, and the other permanent members are Ferdinand A. Hermens, Stephen Kertesz, William O. Shanahan, and Matthew A. Fitzsimons.

The June issue of the *Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society* is devoted to articles on Jewish American trade-unionism.

The *American Economic Review* for May, 1952, is devoted to the papers and proceedings of the sixty-fourth annual meeting of the American Economic Association held in Boston, Massachusetts, December 26-29, 1951.

The allocution of His Holiness Pope Pius XII addressed on April 22 to the delegates at the closing of the congress commemorating the eighth centenary of the *Decretum* of Gratian is published in English translation in the July number of the *Jurist*.

In *Bibliografia missionaria* (Pontificia Biblioteca Missionaria de Prop. Fide, Roma, Piazza di Spagna 48) for 1951 numbers 947-1087 concern Latin America and 1088-1134, the United States and Canada.

The Spring, 1952, issue of the *Annals* of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States presents a symposium on Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ukrainian scholar of the last century.

Professor Friedrich Stegmüller of the University of Freiburg im Breisgau is the author of a four-volume *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* published by the Instituto Fr. Suarez, Madrid. The first volume contains a long treatment of apocryphal writings (pp. 25 to 250) and a list of prefaces to

the Bible (pp. 253-306). After this introductory matter the work presents in alphabetical order the authors of patristic and mediaeval commentaries on the Bible, indicating incipits and explicits, the editions, manuscripts, and bibliography.

The *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte* is again being published as an "international journal concerned with the history of the Reformation and its significance in world affairs" under the auspices of the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte and the American Society for Reformation Research. The American editors are Harold J. Grimm, professor of history in the Ohio State University, and Roland H. Bainton, professor of church history, Yale University. The subscription price for two 144-page issues is five dollars, or four dollars for members of either society. American subscribers are requested to send their subscriptions to Professor George W. Forell, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota. There is great need for study of the period to which this review devotes itself. The editors are anxious to secure further co-operation of Catholic historians in their work. The articles that appeared in the 1951 volume (Jahrgang 42), three of which are in English, are listed in our Periodical Literature.

The Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life founded by G. G. Coulton are being continued in a second series by the Cambridge University Press. Dom David Knowles is now the editor. Two volumes, *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely* by Edward Miller and *Tavistock Abbey* by H. P. R. Finberg have appeared.

The *Times Literary Supplement* for June 6 and 13 contains a bibliography by N. J. Abercrombie of the writings of Edmund Bishop (1846-1917), distinguished historian of liturgy.

In its issue of August 29 the *Times Literary Supplement* stated, "The most interesting event in English history since the war has been the successful launching of *History Today*, an illustrated monthly which has given high-grade history a popular appeal for perhaps the first time." The editors are Peter Quennell and Alan Hodge and the journal sells for half a crown an issue. The address is 72 Coleman Street, London E.C.2, England.

The University of Notre Dame announces the promotion of James A. Corbett to full professor and Marshall T. Smelser and Boleslaw Szczesniak to associate professor, and the appointment of William H. Miller and Richard Balfe as instructors. Vincent P. De Santis, who was recalled by the army during the year 1951-1952, has returned to the University of

Notre Dame. Thomas N. Brown has also returned after a year's leave of absence spent in research on the history of Irish immigration.

Boleslaw Szczesniak of the University of Notre Dame visited Europe during the summer months gathering manuscripts in Rome, Paris, and Lisbon concerning the Chinese explorations and writing of Athanasius Kircher and Michael Boym, Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century. Mr. Szczesniak received a grant-in-aid from the American Philosophical Society to assist him in his researches.

On July 15 Professor Paul S. Lietz was appointed chairman of the Department of History in Loyola University, Chicago. Dr. Lietz has been a member of the faculty at Loyola since 1931, where he has specialized in Latin American history. He spent the summers of 1947 and 1950 in South America and Cuba as a participant in the Exchange Persons Program of the Department of State.

The sessions of the First Inter-American Congress of Religious History and Art, scheduled to be held in Buenos Aires in September, have been cancelled.

The dates of the Medina centennial celebration have been changed to November 6-8.

The May 25, 1952, edition of the *Weekly Catholic* of Saginaw, Michigan, including an elaborate second section of 112 pages, was entirely devoted to the history of the Church in that area of east-central lower Michigan. Although the Diocese of Saginaw is only fourteen years old, missionaries have worked there since the late seventeenth century, and in 1852 organized Catholic life in the Saginaw area had its start with St. Andrew's Parish. Bishop Stephen S. Woznicki took the occasion of the centenary to have recorded all the available evidence on the origins of Catholic life in the diocese. The prelates and religious communities are written up, and in the second edition, arranged by deaneries, there are well-illustrated parish histories. The editor says of these latter: "We have left in them many local touches of color and perhaps of exaggeration that would not be proper in a scientifically written history. . . ." The materials brought together are planned to serve as a basis for a complete history of Catholicism in Saginaw some time in the future. Bishop Woznicki with the co-operation of the editor, the Reverend Neil O'Connor, and many others of the clergy and laity who have made this edition possible, has done much to preserve a good part of Michigan's Catholic heritage. The centennial celebration on May 25 included a pontifical Mass of thanksgiving at St. Andrew's, a civic dedication of a monument at Ojib-

way Island to Henri Nouvel, S.J. (first missionary to the area in 1675), and an historical pageant at Hoyt Park.

The cause of Church history suffered a great loss in the death on November 20, 1951, of Augustin Fliche, professor in the University of Montpellier. The author of many volumes on mediaeval history, he was best known to American readers as one of the editors of the vast *Histoire de l'église* being published by Bloud et Gay.

Canon Ernest Charles Messenger, convert to the Church in his youth, alumnus of St. Edmund's, Ware, and a Ph.D. of the University of Louvain, died on December 25, 1951. He translated into English two volumes of the latest edition of De Wulf's *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* and was engaged in translating the early volumes of the Fliche et Martin, *Histoire de l'église*. Of his own writings, *The Reformation, The Mass and the Priesthood* (2 volumes, 1936-1937), is historical.

Vincent Ussani, Italian philologist in the fields of both classical and Christian Latin, died in Rome on February 1. He edited *Studi medievali* and represented Italy in the project of the new Du Cange dictionary of Mediaeval Latin.

Sister M. Gerardus Lanigan, S.S.J., of St. Joseph's College for Women in Brooklyn died on July 11. Sister Gerardus had been head of the Department of History since 1924. A veteran member of the American Catholic Historical Association, she took great interest in its activities. She attended the University of Notre Dame, the University of Pennsylvania, and took her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Fordham University.

# PERIODICAL LITERATURE

## MISCELLANEOUS

The Church and Civil Governments. Arthur H. Ryan (*Studies*, June).
Patriotism and the Next Best Thing. John Murray (*ibid.*).
Design in Stained Glass. Daniel Shields (*ibid.*).
Devotion to Our Lady: Old and New. Aubrey Gwynn (*ibid.*).
The Church and the Democratic State. Gustave Weigel (*Thought*, Summer, 1952).
Islam and Christianity. Robert Montagne (*ibid.*).
Humanism and Christianity. Rudolf Bultmann (*Jrn. of Religion*, Apr.).
Rationalism, Principles, and Politics. Shirley Robin Letwin (*Rev. of Politics*, July).
Church and State. Lord Quickswood (*Church Quart. Rev.*, July).
The "Edict of Milan." John Bligh (*ibid.*).
Où en est la question des manuscrits de la Mer Morte? Nouvelles decouvertes. A. Vincent (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, July).
L'Apocalypse et le sens chrétien de l'histoire. J. Rohmer (*ibid.*).
Estudios sobre escultura romana en los museos de España y Portugal. A. García y Bellido (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos*, Jan.).
Bibliographie: Histoire ancienne du christianisme. Marcel Simon (*Revue historique*, July).
Das Petrusgrab am Vatikan. Alfons Maria Schneider (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, June).
Les actes du martyr Apollonius et le problème de la base juridique des persécutions. E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Apr.).
La session VI du concile de Trente (13 janvier 1547). Ferdinand Cavallera (*ibid.*).
Tre sacrofaghi importanti da S. Sebastiano. A. Ferrua (*Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, Anno XXVII, Nos. 1-4, 1951).
Ueber einige probleme der Didache-Ueberlieferung. E. Peterson (*ibid.*)
La crypte en triconque de Theopolis. F. Benoit (*ibid.*).
Il "sarcofago di Lot" scoperto a S. Sebastiano. L. De Bruyne (*ibid.*).
Due nuovi sarcofagi paleocristiani con data consolare. L. De Bruyne (*ibid.*).
L'inscription du baptistère de Saint-Thècle à Milan et le De sacramentis de saint Ambroise. O. Perler (*ibid.*).
Mythologische und biblische Themen in der Sarkophagplastik des 3. Jahrhunderts. J. Fink (*ibid.*).
Iscrizioni sepolcrali cristiane da S. Maria Capua Vetere. A. de Franciscis (*ibid.*).
Une basilique byzantine de Byzacène. P. Garrigue (*ibid.*).
Rinvenimenti fortuiti di sculture paleocristiane a Siracusa. S. L. Agnello (*ibid.*).
La tomba Apostolica al Vaticano. L. De Bruyne (*ibid.*).
The Bible in Persian Translation. Walter J. Fischel (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Jan.).
Kingdom and Policy in Eusebius of Caesarea. F. Edward Cranz (*ibid.*).
I Sacramenti della Penitenza e dell'Ordine nella dottrina giuridica di S. Innocenzo I (401-417). Oreste Vighetti (*Miscellanea Francescana*, Jan-Dec., 1951).
Il P. Vincenzo Coronelli, O.F.M.Conv. (1650-1718) nel III centenario della nascita (*ibid.*).
S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio (1676-1751) e S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori (1696-1787). Benedetto Innocenti, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
La "Règle de Perfection" de Benoit de Canfield, O.F.M.Cap. (1562-1610). Léon Veuthey, O.F.M.Conv. (*ibid.*).

Innocent Ier et le canon de la messe. B. Capelle, O.S.B. (*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, Jan.).

Sitivit anima mea ad Deum fontem vivum. (Ps. 41, 3). B. Botte, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Die Ps.-Dionysiuskommentare "In Coelestem Hierarchiam" des Skotus Eriugena und Hugo von St.-Viktor. H. Weisweiler, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Essai sur les "Quaestiones in epistolas Pauli" du Ps.-Hugues de Saint-Victor. P. Glorieux (*ibid.*).

L'objet et le "medium" de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIIIe siècle. H.-F. Dondaine, O.P. (*ibid.*).

The Powers of the Soul. An Early Unpublished Text. D. A. Callus, O.P. (*ibid.*).

The Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451-1951. Edward Hagemann (*Histor. Bull.*, May).

Jesuit Bibliography, II. E. J. Burrus (*ibid.*).

Primat, Communio und Kirche bei den frühen syrischen Monophysiten. W. de Vries, S.I. (*Orientalia christiana periodica*, Vol. XVIII, N. 1-2, 1952).

Nuovi documenti pontifici sui monasteri del Sinai e del monte Athos. A. Mercati (*ibid.*).

Quaestiones Cyrillo-Methodianae. Franc Grivec (*ibid.*).

La controverse sur l'auteur de *l'Elenchos*. P. Nautin (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Vol. XLVII, Nos. 1-2, 1952).

Le commentaire inédit de Jean Scot Erigène su mètre IX du livre III du *De consolatione de Boèce*. H. Silvestre (*ibid.*).

Fondation, approbation, confirmation de l'ordre des Prêcheurs. M. H. Vicaire (*ibid.*).

Origène et l'oblation à faire au Père par le Fils, d'après le papyrus de Toura. B. Capelle (*ibid.*).

Une ancienne rédaction des Coutumes cisterciennes. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).

La bulle de confirmation des Prêcheurs. M. H. Vicaire (*ibid.*).

Le légat Nicolas de Cuse à Louvain (janv. et févr. 1452). J. Paquet (*ibid.*).

Trois lettres inédites de Jansénius. J. Mogenet (*ibid.*).

La traduzione di Burgundio Pisano delle omelie di S. Giovanni Crisostomo sopra Matteo. M. Flecchia (*Aevum*, Mar.).

Das Schisma des Photius in neuer Sicht. Franz Xaver Seppelt (*Theologische Revue*, No. 3, 1952).

La légende de la sainte épine de Pise. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Tomus LXX, Fasc. I et II, 1952).

Vie de S. Germain l'Hagiorite par son contemporain le patriarche Philothée de Constantinople. Pierre Joannou (*ibid.*).

Inscriptions grecques relatives à l'hagiographie. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

L'Egypte, Chypre, la Crète et les autres îles grecques. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

La Grèce continentale et les pays balkaniques. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

L'Italie et la Sicile. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

Une *Passio S. Apolloniae* inédite, suivie d'un miracle en Bourgogne. D'après des manuscrits bavarois. Maurice Coens (*ibid.*).

La Passion de S. Vincent d'Agen. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*ibid.*).

Vie de Baudouin de Boucle. Paul Grosjean (*ibid.*).

Intorno al testo della "Vita Scholastica" di Bonvesin de la Riva. E. Franceschini (*Aevum*, Jan.).

La processione dello Spirito Santo secondo i padri greci. M. Simonetti (*ibid.*).

Zum dem Apokryphen Briefwechsel zwischen dem Philosophen Seneca und dem Apostel Paulus. A. Kurfess (*ibid.*).

Nota sul commento di Benvenuto da Imola alla *Divina Commedia*. A. Prezioso (*ibid.*).

Un commento provenzale sulla Messa del principio del '300. D. Zorzi (*ibid.*).

Un manuscrit de comput ecclésiastique mal connu de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid. A. Cordoliani (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos*, Jan.).

Problemática y soluciones del llamado "Derecho de propiedad intelectual" en la doctrina y en la legislación universal. Francisco Cervera (*ibid.*).

Baldwin of Flanders and Hainaut, First Latin Emperor of Constantinople: His Life, Death, and Resurrection, 1172-1225. R. L. Wolff (*Speculum*, July).

The Capture of Corinth by the Onogurs and Its Recapture by the Byzantines. Peter Charanis (*ibid.*).

The Emperor Constans II and the Capture of Corinth by the Onogur Bulgars. Kenneth M. Setton (*ibid.*).

Les scolastiques citent-ils les Pères de première main? H.-F. Dondaine (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Apr.).

Les origines des missions au moyen âge. Daniel-Rops (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, June).

Un mystérieux ami de Marbode: le "redoutable poète" Gautier. Maurice Delbouille (*Le moyen âge*, Nos. 3-4, 1951).

"Allodium" dans les textes latins du moyen âge. Henri Dubled (*ibid.*).

Comment on rédigeait une lettre au X$^{e}$ siècle. L'épitre d'Eracle de Liège à Rathier de Verone. H. Silvestre (*ibid.*, Nos. 1-2, 1952).

Le style pisan. Son emploi. Sa diffusion géographique. Ch. Higounet (*ibid.*).

Aux origines de la renaissance juridique. Concepts juridiques et influences romanisantes chez Guillaume de Poitiers, biographe du Conquérant. R. Foreville (*ibid.*).

Essai d'attribution du n° 117 (éd. Hilka Schumann) des *Carmina Burana*. M. Delbouille (*ibid.*).

St. Thomas and the Knowledge of the Singular. George P. Klubertanz, S.J. (*New Scholasticism*, Apr.).

Participation and the Thomistic Five Ways. Charles A. Hart (*ibid.*, July).

St. Augustine's Metaphysics and Stoic Doctrine. Sr. Rita Marie Bushman, C.S.J. (*ibid.*).

The Nature and Uses of Liberty. Gerard Smith, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Metodi e manuali di meditazione nella spiritualità cattolica alla fine del medio evo. Paolo Brezzi (*Convivium*, No. 2, 1952).

Convegno di studi storici su Xan Colombano a Bobbio. Emilio Nasalli Rocca (*ibid.*).

Les manuscrits grecs de Richelieu. C. Astruc (*Scriptorium*, Tome VI, no. 1, 1952).

A Medieval Description of Two Illuminated Psalters. F. Wormald (*ibid.*).

Zwei unbekannte Libanioshandschriften der Oesterreichischen Nationalbibliothek. H. Hunger (*ibid.*).

Membra disiecta d'un ms d'Anastase le Sinaïte contenant des fragments d'Hippolyte de Rome. E. Hulshoff Pol (*ibid.*).

Mastre Richard, A Thirteenth Century Translator of the "De Re Militari" of Vegetius. L. Thorpe (*ibid.*).

Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Liessies. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).

Methods of Book-Production in a XIVth Century French Miscellany (London, B.M., ms Royal 19. D. I.), D. J. A. Ross (*ibid.*).

Un abbé de Clairvaux bibliophile: Pierre de Virey (1471-96). A. Vernet (*ibid.*).

Découverte de la dernière partie du manuscrit florentin des Nouvelles de Justinien. K. A. de Meyier (*ibid.*).

Gothic Palimpsests of Bobbio. M. van den Hout (*ibid.*).

Bible mosane ou bible aquitaine? J. Porcher (*ibid.*).

Note on Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae* II. J. Hammer (*ibid.*).

Le manuscrit ex-Bement du "Songe du Verger." L. Mourin (*ibid.*).

A Note on the Calendar of Cashel. J. Hennig (*ibid.*).

Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. P. O. Kristeller (*ibid.*).

Expositions de manuscrits. L. M. J. Delaissé et F. Masai (*ibid.*).

A economia das Canárias nos séculos XIV e XV. Vitorino Magalhaes Godinho (*Revista de história*, Apr.).

Der Begriff traditiones im Trienter Konsilsdekret der Sessio IV. Wilhelm Koch (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Heft 1-2, 1952).

Hilarius von Poitiers, ein Vertreter der christlichen Gnosis. Johannes Beumer, S.J. (*ibid.*, Heft 2, 1952).

Deux notes historiques sur les voeux dans la Compagnie de Jésus. Charles Van de Vorst, S.I. (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, Jan.).

Archconfraternity of the Passion. Marshall Schug, O.F.M.Cap. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, July).

Theologie und Sozialordnung bei Calvin. Erik Wolf (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Jahrgang 42, Heft 1/2, 1951).

The Querela Pacis of Erasmus, Classical and Christian Sources. Roland H. Bainton (*ibid.*).

Some Observations of Luther on Ancient Pre-Greek History. Karl H. Dannenfeldt (*ibid.*).

Melanchthons Naturrechtslehre. Clemens Bauer (*ibid.*).

Ergänzungen zum Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas. Walter Delius (*ibid.*).

Le Vatican et les églises orientales. Eug. Cardinal Tisserant (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, May).

"Sobornost" ou Papauté? II. La notion catholique de la Papauté. G. Dejaifve, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Six campagnes de fouilles à Mari (1933-1939). Ch.-F. Jean (*ibid.*).

Nel quarto centenario della chiesa cattolica caldea. G. de Vries, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica*, May).

Surviving Influence of Mission Contact on the Daly River. Australia. R. M. Berndt (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft—Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire*, Fasc. 2, 1952).

Kirishitan-Kunst. Hubert Cieslik, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Origine du Vicariat Apostolique de l'Afrique Centrale. M. Storme, C.I.C.M. (*ibid.*).

Die Errichtung des apostolischen Vikariates Madras. Nik. Kowalsky, O.M.I. (*ibid.*).

Les catholiques et la république populaire de Chine. A. Grandier (*Etudes*, May).

EUROPEAN

Les relations intellectuelles entre la France et la Norvège (1150-1214). Arne Odd Johnsen (*Le moyen âge*, Nos. 2-4, 1951).

Règlement des conflits internationaux franco-anglais au XIV^e^ siècle (1293-1377). Pierre Chaplais (*ibid.*).

Une administration médiévale aux prises avec la disette. La question des blés dans les provinces italiennes de l'état pontifical en 1374-1375. Jean Glénisson (*ibid.*).

La préparation intellectuelle et professionnelle à l'activité économique en Italie du XIV^e^ au XVI^e^ siècle. Amintore Fanfani (*ibid.*).

Essai sur l'évolution territoriale des principautés françaises (X^e^-XIII^e^ siècles). Etude de géographie historique. P. Feuchère (*ibid.*, Nos. 1-2, 1952).

En marge des négociations concordataires. Le P. de Clorivière et le St-Siège. A. Rayez (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Vol. XLVII, Nos. 1-2, 1952).

Charles de Blois fut-il canonisé en 1376? N. M. Denis-Boulet (*ibid.*).

L'activité pastorale d'un grand archevêque: Antoine Pierre Ier de Grammont (1615-1698). P. Broutin, S.I. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, July).

De Carmelitarum Belgicorum actione antijansenistica iuxta chartas P. Seraphini a Jesu-Maria (1668-1688). Lucianus Ceyssens, O.F.M. (*Analecta ordinis carmelitarum*, Vol. XVII, Fasc. I, 1952).

Le Carmel en Arvor. H. Jouin-Dubois (*ibid.*).

Provinciae Carmelitanae in Italia usque ad Capitulum Generale Astense a. 1472. Ludovicus M. Saggi, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).

Ernest Coeurderoy: A Prophet of Revolution. Hans Kohn (*Cambridge Jrn.*, July).

Florence and Despots: Some Aspects of Florentine Diplomacy in the Fourteenth Century. N. Rubenstein (*Transactions of the Royal Histor. Soc.*, Fifth Series, Vol. 2, 1952).

The Anti-Florentine Discourses of the Doge Tommaso Mocenigo (1414-23): their Date and Partial Forgery. Hans Baron (*Speculum*, July).

Cardinal Antonio Barberini. Vernon Wagner, O.F.M.Cap. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, July).

Le pubbliche scuole in Vicenza durante il medio evo e l'umanesimo. V. Sansonetti (*Aevum*, Mar.).

Intagliatori gesuiti italiani dei secoli XVI e XVII. Pietro Pirri, S.I. (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, Jan.).

De P. Lanicii vita spirituali novis illustrata documentis. Ignatius Iparraguirre, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Trois Jésuites flamands dans l'Allemagne du XVI[e] siècle. Arboreus, Sylvius, Donius. Jean-Baptiste Goetstouwers, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Vittorio Amedeo III di Savoia nei dispacci inediti di un diplomatico portoghese (agosto 1789-giugno 1790). Giuseppe Carlo Rossi (*Rassegna storica del Risorgimento*, Jan.).

La politica italiana del Direttorio nel 1799 e la missione a Roma dell'ambasciatore Bertolio. Vittorio E. Giuntella (*ibid.*).

Carteggi superstiti della segreteria di stato borbonica degli affari esteri. Giuseppe Coniglio (*ibid.*).

Confidenze e sfoghi di funzionari della polizia austriaca (1816-1834). Maria Brunetti (*ibid.*).

Avventure e disavventure di gerenti di periodici mazziniani. Leonida Balestreri (*ibid.*).

La Roscana dal 1849 al 1859. Sergio Camerani (*ibid.*).

La literature patrística española continuadora de la estética de los clásicos. José Madoz, S.J. (*Universidad*, Jan., 1950).

Consideraciones sobre nuestra Reconquista. Felipe Mateu Llopis (*Hispania*, Jan., 1951).

En torno a la revolución catalana de 1640. Notas a una correspondencia inédita. Eulogio Zudaire, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Consideraciones acerca de los inicios del medioevo hispánico, y la alta Reconquista. Federico Udina Martorell (*ibid.*, Apr. 1951).

De cuando España vivía unida al Imperio. María del Carmen Mazario Coleto (*ibid.*).

La ordenación de Cataluña por Felipe V: la Nueva Planta. Juan Mercader Riba (*ibid.*).

The Diplomatic Background of the Spanish Revolution of 1868. Willard A. Smith (*Historian*, Spring, 1951).

El problema protestante en España. J. M. Granero (*Razón y fe*, June).

Les classes rurales en Bavière au moyen âge. Charles-Edmond Perrin (*Revue historique*, July).

Der Katharinenpredigt Heinrichs von Langenstein: Eine programmatische Rede des Gründers der Wiener Universität über den Aufbau der Glaubensbegrüdung und die Organisation der Wissenschaften. Albert Lang (*Divus Thomas*, Sept., 1948).

Georg Spalatins Bedeutung für die Reformation und die Organisation der lutherischen Landeskirche. Irmgard Hoesh (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Jahrgang 42, Heft 1/2, 1951.)

Geistliches und weltliches Regiment in der schwedischen Reformation. Heinz-Horst Schrey (*ibid.*).

The Failure of Church Unification Efforts during the German Reformation (In memoriam Martini Buceri, 27. Februar 1551). Hastings Eells (*ibid.*).

Zur Beurteilung der Utrechter Union. Arno Duch (*ibid.*).

Schweden und Deutschland während der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten 1645-1660. Sven Göransson (*ibid.*).

Forschungsbericht: Stand und Aufgabe der Butzer-Forschung. Robert Stupperich (*ibid.*).

Die tübinger kath.-theologische Fakultät und die württembergische Regierung vom Weggang J. A. Möhlers (1835) bis zur Pensionierung J. S. Dreys (1846). Max Miller (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Heft 1-2, 1952).

Re-thinking Recent German History. Hans Kohn (*Rev. of Politics*, July).
The Free Germany Committee—An Historical Study. Andreas F. Lowenfeld (*ibid.*).
Some Notes on Swedish Historiography. Ragnhild Hatten (*History*, June).
Libertà religiosa in Iugoslavia. F. Cavalli, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica*, July).
The Czechoslovak Constitutional System: The Soviet Impact. H. Gordon Skilling (*Political Science Quart.*, June).
The Intellectuals and European Society. Leonard Krieger (*ibid.*).
Ukraine as the Geopolitical Basis of Russian Imperialism. Roman Smal-Stocki (*Ukrainian Quart.*, Spring, 1952).
Der methodische Zugang zu Dostojewskijs philosophischer Weltanschauung. Reinhard Lauth (*Orientalia christiana periodica*, Vol. XVIII, N. 1-2, 1952).
Die restlichen vier unveröffentlichten Briefe Isidors von Kijev. Adolf W. Ziegler (*ibid.*).
Quellen zu Isidor von Kiew als Kardinal und Patriarch. G. Hofmann, S.I. (*ibid.*).
L'Udovit Stur and Russian Panslavism. Michael B. Petrovich (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Apr.).
The Italian Anti-Fascist Emigration. Charles F. Delzell (*ibid.*).
Russia—West or East? Leonard Walton (*Dublin Rev.*, Second Quart., 1952).

ENGLISH AND IRISH

The Miracle of St. Cuthbert at Farne. Edmund Craster (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Tomus LXX, Fasc. I et II, 1952).
The Church in England between the Death of Bede and the Danish Invasion. D. J. D. Fisher (*Transactions of the oRyal Histor. Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 2, 1952).
Edward III and the Beginning ot the Hundred Years War. G. Tempelman (*ibid.*).
The State and Landed Interests in Thirteenth Century France and England. Edward Miller (*ibid.*).
State Trials under Richard II. T. F. T. Plucknett (*ibid.*).
The Submission of Edward the Elder. F. T. Wainwright (*History*, June).
The Revival of Feudalism in Early Tudor England. J. B. Hurstfield (*ibid.*).
Der englische Katholizismus. G. Kranz (*Stimmen der Zeit*, July).
The Friars Minor in England—Their Historical Continuity. Howard Docherty, O.F.M. (*Clergy Rev.*, June).
Father Thurston. J. J. Dwyer (*ibid.*).
En quel sens peut-on parler de "méthode scientifique" chez Roger Bacon? Gilles Meyer, O.F.M. (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Apr.).
David Hume and St. John of the Cross. Frederick C. Copleston (*Month*, Aug.).
An Elizabethan Adventurer. The Career of Sir Antony Standen. Geoffrey Ashe (*ibid.*).
St. Thomas More. Sir Henry Slesser (*ibid.*).
Biblizismus und natürliche Theologie in der Gewissenslehre des englischen Puritanismus. Martin Schmidt (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Jahrgang 42, Heft 1/2, 1951).
St. Willibrord and Ireland. Hubert Janssens, O.S.B. (*Irish Eccles. Rec.*, May).
Irish Names in the Malines Ordination Registers, 1602-1794. Brendan Jennings, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
Dr. Russell and the Dublin Review. P. J. McLaughlin (*Studies*, June).

AMERICAN

Bibliography of United States Church History, 1951. E. R. Vollmer (*Histor. Bull.*, May).
Carl Becker: The Historian as a Literary Craftsman. Charlotte Watkins Smith (*William and Mary Quart.*, July).

A Voyage to the Miami Region in 1793. Richard K. Murdoch (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, July).

The Role of William Vans Murray in the Peace Negotiations between France and the United States, 1800. Alexander De Conde (*Huntington Library Quart.*, Feb.).

Foreclosure of a Peacemaker's Career: A Criticism of Thomas Jefferson's Diplomatic Isolation. Alexander De Conde (*ibid.*, May).

Propaganda Uses of the Underground Railroad. Larry Gara (*Mid-America*, July).

The Missouri Radicals and the Re-Election of Lincoln. David D. March (*ibid.*).

Early Variety Theatres in the Trans-Mississippi West. Harold E. Briggs (*ibid.*).

The Catholic Factor in Urban Welfare: The Early Period, 1850-1880. Aaron I. Abell (*Rev. of Politics*, July).

Reform of the Electoral System. Ruth C. Silva (*ibid.*).

Origins of Immigration Restrictions, 1882-1897: A Social Analysis. John Higham (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, June).

The Democratic Theme in American Historical Literature. Merle Curti (*ibid.*).

Archbishop Messmer-I. B. J. Blied (*Social Justice Rev.*, June).

L'influence de Colbert sur l'oeuvre de Jean Talon. Roland Lamontagne (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique Française*, June).

Un dossier de plantation de St.-Dominique. Roger Massio (*ibid.*).

Le séminaire de Québec en 1848. Arthur Maheux (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, June).

The Evolution of the Colombian Tobacco Trade, to 1875. John P. Harrison (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, May).

Maximilian's Relations with Brazil. Richard B. McCormack (*ibid.*).

El Obispado de las Californias y el vicariato apostólico de la Baja California. José Bravo Ugarte (*Abside*, Apr.).

Guadalupe en más pleno fulgor liturgico. Alfonso Méndez Plancarte (*ibid.*).

Las expediciones o reemplazos militares enviados desde Cádiz a reprimir el movimento de independencia de Hispanoamérica. A. Matilla Tascón (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos*, Jan.).

El mito de la intervención de los jesuítas en la independencia hispanoamericana. M. Batllori (*Razón y fe*, May).

Maquinaciones del abate Godoy en Londres en favor de la independencia hispanoamericana. Miguel Batllori, S.I. (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, Jan.).

Some Letters of Sarmiento and Mary Mann, 1865-1876, Part I. Alice Houston Luiggi (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, May).

Um médico na contenda entre o bispo D. Pero Fernandes Sardinha e o governador Duarte da Costa. Lycurgo de Castro Santos Filho (*Revista de história*, July).

O protestantismo brasileiro. Estudo de eclesiologia e de história social. Emile G. Léonard (*ibid.*).

Dom Frei José Fialho, bispo de Olinda e arcebispo da Baía Bonifácio Mueller, O.F.M. (*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, June).

Metropolitanismo e regalismo no Brasil durante a nunciatura de Lourenço Caleppi. Maurílio Cesar de Lima (*Revista de história*, Apr.).

L'illuminisme dans un protestantisme de constitution récente (Brésil). E.-G. Léonard (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Jan.).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Anglo-Jewish Association. *Germany's New Nazis.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. x, 76. $2.75.)

Bailey, Stephen K. and Howard D. Samuel. *Congress at Work.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1952. Pp. x, 502. $3.50.)

Bannon, John Francis. *History of the Americas.* Vol. I. *The Colonial Americas.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1952. Pp. xii, 582. $5.50.)

Barck, Oscar Theodore, Jr., and Nelson Manfred Blake. *Since 1900. A History of the United States in Our Times.* Revised Edition. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1952. Pp. x, 903. $5.90.)

Barrett, Cecil J., C.C. *Adoption. The Parent, the Child, the Hour.* Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, Ltd. 1952. Pp. 97. 6/-.)

Baumer, Franklin Le Van (Ed.). *Main Currents of Western Thought. Readings in Western European Intellectual History from the Middle Ages to the Present.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1952. Pp. xvi, 699. Text $5.50; Trade, $7.50.)

Becker, Carl, Sidney Painter and Yu-Shan Han. *The Past That Lives Today.* (New York: Silver Burdett Co. 1952. Pp. viii, 856.)

Beckett, J. C. *A Short History of Ireland.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc. 1952. Pp. viii, 208. Text $1.80; Trade $2.25.) The lecturer in modern history in the Queen's University of Belfast contributes here a new volume to Hutchinson's University Library edited by Sir Maurice Powicke. The book has been published in recognition of the renewed interest in Irish history of late years. It has a bibliography of five pages and a ten-page index. One misses the names of famous Irish Catholic prelates of the nineteenth century like Archbishops Troy, MacHale, and Murray, and the characterization of the years 1691-1800 as "The Protestant Nation" would seem to overemphasize the religious persuasion of the governing minority at the expense of the vast majority of the governed who were, of course, Catholics.

Biesele, Rudolph L., John S. Ezell, and Gilbert C. Fite (Eds.). *Readings in American History.* Vol. I. *1492-1865.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1952. Pp. xi, 361. $2.50.)

Binkley, William C. *The Texas Revolution.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1952. Pp. viii, 132. $2.50.)

Bonn, M. J. *Whither Europe—Union or Partnership?* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1952. Pp. 207. $3.75.)

Bourret, F. M. *The Gold Coast. A Survey of the Gold Coast and British Togoland, 1919-1951.* Revised Edition. (Stanford University Press. 1952. Pp. xiii, 248. $5.00.) A second and revised edition of the volume by Mother Bourret of the San Francisco College for Women which won the top award in the European history section by the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association in 1950. The original edition was reviewed in this journal in October, 1950.

Brogan, D. W. *The Price of Revolution.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1951. Pp. viii, 280. $3.50.)

Browne, Henry J. *St. Ann's on East Twelfth Street, New York City, 1852-1952.* (New York: The Roman Catholic Church of St. Ann. 1952. Pp. v, 66.)

Bruce, Harold R. *A College Text in American National Government.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1952. Pp. xi, 836. $5.50.) This volume is by a professor of government in Dartmouth College.

Bruckberger, Raymond Leopold. *One Sky to Share. The French and American Journals of Raymond Leopold Bruckberger, Dominican.* Translated by Dorothy Carr Howell. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1952. Pp. 248. $3.00.)

Burke, Redmond A., C.S.V. *What Is the Index?* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1952. Pp. x, 129. $2.75.) A popular exposition of the procedures of Catholic censorship and condemnation of published books. Various appendices list major authors whose *opera omnia* are on the Index, authors of English publications, recommendations of the Abbé Bethleem, etc. The "Great Books" program receives special mention.

Calkin. Homer L., Meyer H. Fishbein, and Leo Pascal (Compilers). *Records of the National Recovery Administration.* (Washington: National Archives. 1952. Pp. viii, 226.)

Calvo, Julián. *El primer formulario juridico publicado en la nueva Espana: La "Politica de Escrituras" de Nicolas de Irolo (1605).* (Mexico: Imprenta Universitaria. 1952. Pp. 77.)

Carman, Harry J. and Harold C. Syrett. *A History of the American People.* Vol. I. *To 1865.* Vol. II. *Since 1865.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1952. Pp. xxiv, 756, xxi; xix, 812, xxv. Text $5.75 each; Trade $15.00 boxed set.) An attractive appearing two-volume text by two professors in Columbia University with numerous illustrations, charts, and maps.

Chambers, M. M. *The Colleges and the Courts, 1946-1950. Judicial Decisions Regarding Higher Education in the United States.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. x, 202. $3.00.)

Chudoba, Bohdan. *Spain and the Empire: 1519-1643.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1952. Pp. ix, 299. $5.00.)

Churchill, Winston S. *Closing the Ring.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1951. Pp. xvi, 749. $6.00.)

Costain, Thomas B. *The Silver Chalice. A Story of the Cup of the Last Supper.* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1952. Pp. 533. $3.85.)

Cotner, Robert C., John S. Ezell ,and Gilbert C. Fite (Eds.). *Reading in American History.* Vol. II. *1865 to the Present.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1952. Pp. xii, 403. $2.50.)

Crehan, Joseph, S.J. *Father Thurston. A Memoir with a Bibliography of His Writings.* (London and New York: Sheed & Ward. 1952. Pp. viii, 235. 12/6 net.)

Croix, Paul-Marie de la, O.C.D. *L'Ancien Testament source de vie spirituelle.* (Bruges: Les Etudes Carmélitaines chez Desclée de Brouwer & Cie. 1952. Pp. 930. Broché 225 frs.; relié 275 frs.) A devout commentary upon salient passages of the Old Testament. The author divides his treatment into three parts: God and the soul; divine love; the paths travelled between God and man. There is no intention of presenting a literal commentary; the spiritual lessons which can be drawn from the O.T. are the objects. The author shows a deep knowledge of the O.T. and skillfully brings together hundreds of texts to form a spiritual *vade mecum.*

Culbertson, Thaddeus A. *Journal of an Expedition to the Mauvaises Terres and the Upper Missouri in 1850.* Edited by John Francis McDermott. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 147. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. viii, 164. 75c.)

Dies, Edward. *Behind the Wall Street Curtain.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1952. Pp. 153. $2.75.)

Dubois, Emil. *Catechism in Verse.* Illustrated with Hymns and Prayers. (St. Paul: Catechetical Guild. 1952. Pp. 120. 75c.)

Duff, Charles. *Ireland and the Irish.* (London and New York: T. V. Boardman & Co. Ltd. 1952. Pp. 288. 15/. net.)

Dunin-Borkowski, Wladyslaw, Alexandra Stypulkowska, Jan Szuldrzynski. *The Pattern of Life in Poland.* Vol. V. *The Administration of Justice.* Vol. VI. *The Family* (in one volume). (Paris: Mid-European Research and Planning Centre. 1952. Pp. 74.)

*East Germany under Soviet Control.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. viii, 95. 35c.)

*Eternal Witness. The Missionary Apostolate of the Catholic Church.* (Detroit: Marygrove College. 1952. Pp. vii, 71.)

Finegan, Jack. *The Archeology of World Religions. The Background of Primitivism, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confusianism, Taoism, Shinto, Islam, and Sikhism.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1952. Pp. xl, 599. $10.00.)

Frenay, Adolph, O.P. *The Spirituality of the Mass in the Light of Thomistic Theology.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1952. Pp. x, 296. $4.00.)

Gauthier, Roland, C.S.C. *Sens et valeur de la paternité de Saint Joseph. Conference prononcée à la semaine d'étude de Salamanque, le 30 août 1951.* (Montréal: Fides. 1952. Pp. 24.)

Haas, Francis J. *Man and Society.* Revised edition. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1952. Pp. xxi, 554. $4.50.)

Helton, H. Stephen (Compiler). *Records of the Office of Inter-American Affairs.* (Washington: National Archives. 1952. Pp. v, 138.)

Hexter, J. H. *More's Utopia. The Biography of an Idea.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 171. $3.00.)

Hilger, Sister M. Inez. *Arapaho Child Life and Its Cultural Background.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. xv, 253. 75c.)

Hoehn, Matthew, O.S.B. (Ed.). *Catholic Authors. Contemporary Biographical Sketches.* (Newark: St. Mary's Abbey. 1952. Pp. xiv, 633. $6.50.)

Keller, James. *Government Is Your Business.* (Garden City: Permabooks. 1952. Pp. 383. 35c.)

Klauser, Theodor. *The Western Liturgy and Its History. Some Reflections on Recent Studies.* Translated into English by F. L. Cross. (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd. 1952. Pp. 63. 4/- net.)

Klein, Abbé Felix. *Americanism: A Phantom Heresy.* (Atchison, Kansas: Aquin Book Shop. 1952. Pp. xxx, 345.) An English translation.

———. *La route du petit Morvandiau: Souvenirs.* Tome VII. (Paris: Editions Plon. 1952. Pp. 267. 420 fr.)

Knowles, David and J. K. St. Joseph. *Monastic Sites from the Air.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1952. Pp. xxviii, 283. $11.00.)

*Korea—1950.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. 281. $1.25.)

Kubler, George. *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795-1940. A Population Study Based upon Tax Records and Census Reports.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. vi, 71. 75c.)

Langer, William L. and S. Everett Gleason. *The Challenge to Isolation, 1937-1940.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1952. Pp. xv, 794. $7.50.)

Leslie, Shane. *Salutations to Five. Mrs. Fitzherbert, Edmond Warre, Sir William Butler, Leo Tolstoy, Sir Mark Sykes.* (London: Hollis & Carter, Ltd. 1951. Pp. v, 156. 10c 6d.)

Lynch, John, Archdeacon of Tuam. *Pii Antistitis Icon or the Life of Francis Kirwan, Bishop of Killala.* (Dublin: Stationery Office. 1951. Pp. 116. 15/-.) This is a reproduction in collotype facsimile of the very rare work published in 1669 at St. Malo in Brittany. It has been reproduced at the Ordnance Survey in Dublin and a brief foreword is contributed by R. I. Best, chairman of the Irish Manuscripts Commission.

Lynn, Rita L. *The National Catholic Community Service in World War II.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 290. $3.50.)

Lynskey, Elizabeth M. *The Government of the Catholic Church.* Introduction by John J. Meng, Foreword by George N. Shuster. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1952. Pp. x, 102. $2.00.)

McCann, Abbot Justin and Dom Columba Cary-Elwes (Eds.). *Ampleforth and Its Origins. Essays on a Living Tradition by Members of the Ampleforth Community.* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 1952. Pp. xiv, 306. 22/6d.)

*Mandements et lettres pastorales circulaires et autres documents publiés dans le Diocèse de Montréal depuis son erection.* Tomes XIX, XX. (Montreal: Arbour & Dupont. 1952. Pp. 598; 625.)

Marguerite, Sister M. *These Are Our Neighbors.* Second Reader. New Edition. (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1952. Pp. 256. $1.72.)

——— and Catherine Beebe. *This Is Our Parish.* Advanced Second Reader. New Edition. (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1952. Pp. 256. $1.72.)

Marie, Sister Joan, O.P. *Christ in His Church.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1952. Pp. xvi, 656. $4.50.)

Markoe, William M. *Historical Development of the American Flag.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1952. Pp. 16. $1.00.)

Mathew, David. *The Age of Charles I.* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode; New York: British Book Centre, Inc. 1951. Pp. 340. 21s net.)

*Memo to America. The DP Story. The Final Report of the United States Displaced Persons Commission.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. xi, 376. $1.00.)

Mendenhall, Thomas C., Basil D. Henning, Archibald S. Foord. *Foundations of the Modern State. Four Problems in Historical Interpretation.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1952. Pp. viii, 117. $1.75.)

Molloy, John Joseph, O.P. *A Theological Interpretation of the Moral Play, Wisdom, Who Is Christ.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1952. Pp. xviii, 255. $2.50.)

Moorman, John R. H. *The Grey Friars in Cambridge, 1225-1538.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1952. Pp. viii, 277. $7.00.)

Moreau, E. de, S.J. *Histoire de l'église en Belgique.* Vol. V. *L'église des Pays-Bas, 1559-1633.* [*Museum Lessianum.*] (Bruxelles: L'Edition Universelle, S.A. 1952. Pp. 544. 325 fr. belges.)

Morgan, Thomas B. *Faith Is a Weapon. The Vatican Leads in the Fight against Communism.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1952. Pp. vi, 278. $3.75.) The author was a UP correspondent in Rome for many years and writes

a popular account of his travels and experiences throughout Europe in relation to the Church and communism.

Morison, Elting E. (Ed.). *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt.* Vol. V. *The Big Stick, 1905-1907.* Vol. VI. *The Big Stick, 1907-1909.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1952. Pp. xxiv, 864; vi, 850. $20.00 per set.)

Morrison, Hugh. *Early American Architecture.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xiv, 619. $12.50.)

Mounier, Emmanuel. *Personalism.* Translated by Philip Mairet. (New York: Grove Press. 1952. Pp. xx, 132. $3.50.)

Murphy, Francis X., C.SS.R. *Peter Speaks through Leo. The Council of Chalcedon A.D. 451.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 132. $2.75.)

Nichols, James Hastings. *Democracy and the Churches.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1951. Pp. 298. $4.50.)

Nowell, Charles E. *A History of Portugal.* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc. 1952. Pp. xii, 259. $4.50.)

Palmer, Paul F., S.J. *Mary in the Documents of the Church.* With a Word to the Reader by Gerald G. Walsh, S.J. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1952. Pp. xxiv, 129. $2.25.) Father Palmer draws his statements on the Blessed Mother from the early ecclesiastical writers and fathers of the Church, the creeds and canons of councils, and from the official pronouncements of the Holy See. In time they run from the Apostles' Creed to the statements of Pius XII on the occasion of the definition of the Assumption in November, 1950. The original source is indicated in the case of each document and the volume closes with a six-page index.

Pastor, Ludwig von. *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages.* Vol. XXXVIII. *Clement XIV, 1769-1747.* Translated by E. F. Peeler. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1952. Pp. xv, 602. $7.50.)

Perros, George P. (Compiler). *Records of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on War Time Health and Education, 1943-46.* (Washington: National Archives. 1952. Pp. v, 11.)

Pope, Hugh, O.P. *English Versions of the Bible.* Revised and amplified by Sebastian Bullough, O.P. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1952. Pp. ix, 787. $10.00.)

Poray, J. B. and O. S. Zeromska. *The Pattern of Life in Poland.* Vol. VII. *Art and Literature.* (Paris: Mid-European Research and Planning Centre. 1952. Pp. 76.)

Powell, Philip Wayne. *Soldiers, Indians & Silver. The Northward Advance of New Spain, 1550-1600.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1952. Pp. ix, 317. $4.50.)

Previté-Orton, C. W. *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History.* Vol I. *The Later Roman Empire to the Twelfth Century.* Vol. II. *The Twelfth Century to the Renaissance.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1952. Pp. xxi, 643; xix, 558. $12.50 per set.)

Prychodko, Nicholas. *One of the Fifteen Million.* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1952. Pp. xiv, 236. $3.00.

Reinhardt, Kurt F. *The Existentialist Revolt. The Main Themes and Phases of Existentialism.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1952. Pp. vii, 254. $3.50.)

Richardson, H. G. and G. O. Sayles. *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1952. Pp. x, 395. $8.50.)

Richardson, W. C. *Tudor Chamber Administration, 1485-1547.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1952. Pp. xiii, 541. $6.50.) This solidly documented monograph describes the methods of revenue administration devised under Henry VII and carried on under his son.

Rodgers, Andrew Denny III. *Erwin Frink Smith. A Story of North American Plant Pathology.* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. 1952. Pp. x, 675. $5.00.)

Roth, Cecil. *Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. viii, 178. $3.75.)

St. Bernard. *On the Song of Songs.* Translated and edited by a Religious of C.S.M.V. (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd. 1952. Pp. 272. 12/6 net.) A fluent translation by an Anglican religious of about one-third of St. Bernard's unfinished course of sermons on the Canticle of Canticles, arranged for devotional reading.

Scallan, Emeric B. *God Demands Reparation. The Life of Leo Dupont.* (New York: William Frederick Press. 1952. Pp. 213. $3.00.)

Schauinger, J. Herman. *Cathedrals in the Wilderness.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1952. Pp. xiii, 334. $4.00.)

Schechtman, Joseph B. *The Arab Refugee Problem.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. xi, 137. $3.00.)

Seaver, James Everett. *Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire (300-438).* (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications. 1952. Pp. 101. $2.00.)

Sheehan, Most Rev. M. *The Origin of Life. The Case for and against Evolution.* Edited by Michael J. Troy, C.S.Sp. (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd. 1952. Pp. vi, 34. one shilling.)

Shipton, Clifford K. *Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College in the Classes 1726-1730, with Bibliographical and Other Notes.* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1951. Pp. xii, 856. $7.50.)

Sih, Paul K. T. *From Confucius to Christ.* Preface by Fulton J. Sheen (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc. 1952. Pp. xvi, 231. $3.00.)

Simpson, Lesley Byrd. *Many Mexicos.* Third edition revised and enlarged. (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1952. Pp. 349. $5.00.)

Smal-Stocki, Roman. *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1952. Pp. xxv, 474. Paper $5.00; cloth $6.00.)

Snyder, Louis L. *German Nationalism: The Tragedy of a People. Extremism Contra Liberalism in Modern German History.* (Harrisburg: Stackpole Co. 1952. Pp. xiv, 321. $3.75.)

Spiegel, Henry William (Ed.). *The Development of Economic Thought. Great Economists in Perspective.* (New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1952. Pp. xii, 811. $6.50.)

Sulimirski, Tadeusz. *The Pattern of Life in Poland.* Vol. IV. *The Universities, Professional Education and Science.* (Paris: Mid-European Research and Planning Centre. 1952. Pp. 65.)

*Supplement to 1951 Biographic Register of the Department of State.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1952. Pp. xii, 139. 55c.)

Sweet, William Warren. *Religion in the Development of American Culture.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1952. Pp. xiv, 338. $3.50.)

Taffarel, Joseph, S.J. *Jottings of a Poor Missionary.* (N. Malabar, India: The author at Catholic Mission, Mattul. 1950. Pp. iii, 149, xv.)